DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 473 CG 005 508

AUTHOR	Caskey, O. L.; Duvall, Virginia
TITLE	A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Action Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six Year Period 1963-1969.
INSTITUTION	Texas Tech. Univ., Lubbock.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	159p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Patterns, College Freshmen, College Students, Discipline, Discipline Policy, *Discipline Problems, Grade Point Average, Misbehavior, *Sex Differences, *Student Behavior, *Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This study of disciplinary offenders at Texas Tech University was conducted in order to provide information for areas of the campus which deal with various disciplinary activities. The research was limited to those students who had been either suspended or given probation for violating a University regulation. The total sample consisted of 938 disciplinary cases. Data was taken from University records. Findings of the study include: (1) freshmen had considerably more than their share of disciplinary offenses; (2) the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Business Administration had six percent and five percent respectively higher rate of disciplinary offenders than their percent of enrollment would indicate; (3) male students committed only 37 percent of their offenses as individuals whereas 63 per cent of the offenses involving female students were committed by individuals as opposed to a group; and (4) grade point averages of offenders were considerably and consistently lower than the all-campus grade point averages. (KJ)

ED040473

A STUDY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL DISCIPLINARY OFFENDERS INVOLVING ACTION RESULTING IN PROBATION OR SUSPENSION AT TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY FOR THE SIX YEAR PERIOD 1963-1969

Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
Texas Tech University
December 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 005 508

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Summary. 12

Conclusion 24

Review of Recent Disciplinary Studies. . . . 26

Appendix 35

governs student conduct and includes the rules and regulations pertaining to discipline at the University. A copy of this publication, Code of Student Affairs and Rules and Regulations, will be forwarded to interested institutions on request.

O.L. Caskey
Virginia Duvall

FOREWORD

This study of disciplinary offenders at Texas Tech University was conducted in order to provide information for areas of the campus which deal with various disciplinary activities. The arrangement of the material, while somewhat unusual, is purposely sequenced. It enables the reader to inspect the research report to the extent of his interest by the selection of material in succeeding sections. The first pages will give one an over-view of the broad categories of disciplinary action during the past six years on this campus. Some of the general conclusions, which result from the statistical analysis, will be found in the following section. If one is interested in studies from other institutions, a review of disciplinary research from the literature is included. The appendix contains over 150 tables of various types of statistical information derived from the computer analysis of the 938 students involved in major disciplinary offenses during the six-year period covered by the report.

Discipline is a highly individual matter, both for the person involved and the institution where it occurs. No attempts are made herein to provide information other than categorization of disciplinary activities, while causative factors have been meticulously avoided. In like fashion, no attempts are made to compare the institutional policies or disciplinary offenders with other institutions, either from personal knowledge or reports in the professional literature. With such individual differences acknowledged, it is hoped that other universities will avoid either comparing their own disciplinary offenders or deriving value judgments from the statistical information contained in this research report. A more complete understanding of disciplinary offenses at Texas Tech University could best be attained by a familiarity with the Code of Student Affairs which

INTRODUCTION

As is evidenced in a review of the literature, the quantity and quality of research studies concerning college discipline are far from adequate. Even if these studies were more extensive and conclusive, universities vary greatly and results of research at one institution can rarely be applied to another. It is necessary, then, for each university to look thoroughly at their own disciplinary situation at regular intervals.

This disciplinary study at Texas Tech University was made for the purpose of reviewing the disciplinary conditions and the characteristics of students who were involved in disciplinary action. The research was limited to those students who had been either suspended or given probation for violating a University regulation. The time limitation consisted of the regular and summer terms of the years 1963-64 through 1967-68, and the regular sessions of the academic year 1968-69.

For each student, information was collected which composed the twelve variables used in the study. The explanation of these variables can be found on page 2.

Records are kept in the Office of the Assistant Dean for Administration on all students involved in disciplinary procedures. Information such as name, sex, offense, residence, month of action, number involved, school session, year of offense, and action taken were derived from these records. From the permanent registrar files was available information concerning age, school, year in school, marital status, accumulative

Explanation of Variables

1. Age - Actual age of the student.

2. Sex - 1-Male, 2-Female

3. Year in School - 1-Freshman
   2-Sophomore
   3-Junior
   4-Senior

4. Accumulative GPA - Actual grade point average.

5. Semester GPA - Actual grade point average.

6. Academic Load - Actual number of hours enrolled during semester violation occurred.

7. CEEB Verbal - Actual score.

8. CEEB Math - Actual score.

9. CEEB Total - Actual score.

10. Number Involved - 1-One involved in violation.
    2-More than one involved in violation.

11. Socio-Economic Scale - 1-Professional
    2-Skilled
    3-Unskilled
    4-Unknown, retired or deceased

12. Action Taken - 1-Probation
    2-Suspension

grade point average, semester grade point average, academic load, CEEB-SAT test scores, method of entry, state and socio-economic acale. A third source was used--the disciplinary files--when any of the forementioned information was not available in either the disciplinary records or permanent files.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 give the breakdown of offenses by year according to the disciplinary action taken, by percent and in comparison to the total enrollment. The offenses are grouped into twenty-four broad classifications in Table 4.

The description of the sample is found in Table 5 and 6. Table 5 provides a comparison of the sample with the overall University population using select characteristics.

Grade point averages of the students involved in disciplinary action are compared to the grade point averages of each college, class and sex in Table 7.

To determine whether certain times of the year are more conducive to disciplinary offenses, the offenses were classified by month. Table 8 shows this distribution and makes evident that the beginning of each semester and the end of the spring term have more than the usual number of offenses.

In the collection of the data, certain modifications had to be made when information was not available. First semester freshmen did not have accumulative grade point averages. In such cases the semester grade point averages were used. Texas Tech University did not require CEEB-SAT scores until 1962 or 1963. Therefore, many students did not take this entrance test. The averages of the scores of those with test data available were used in these cases. A certain number of students had

Table 1

Breakdown By Year Of Disciplinary Action Taken

	Probation			Suspension		
Year	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1968-69	34	79	113	15	5*	20
1967-68	45	51	96	40	15	55
1966-67	71	35	106	21	29	50
1965-66	130	48	178	40	27	67
1964-65	57	43	100	43	13	56
1963-64	22	30	52	31	15	46
			645			294

*One suspended female student (1968-69) not used as a subject due to lack of pertinent information.

Table 2

Number And Percent Of Offenses Committed For Total Sample By Academic Year

	Male		Female		Total	
Year	#	%	#	%	#	%
1968-69	49	8.9	83	21.3	132	14.1
1967-68	85	15.5	66	17.0	151	16.1
1966-67	92	16.8	64	16.5	156	16.6
1965-66	170	31.0	75	19.3	245	26.1
1964-65	100	18.2	56	14.4	156	16.6
1963-64	53	9.7	45	11.6	98	10.4

Table 3

Enrollment* By Year And Number Of Offenses

	Male			Female			Total		
Year	Enrollment	#	%	Enrollment	#	%	Enrollment	#	%
1968-69	11,504	49	.43	7,530	83	1.10	19,034	132	.69
1967-68	11,336	85	.75	7,310	66	.90	18,646	151	.81
1966-67	10,970	92	.84	6,798	64	.94	17,768	156	.88
1965-66	10,138	170	1.69	6,167	75	1.22	16,305	245	1.50
1964-65	8,730	100	1.15	5,097	56	1.10	13,827	156	1.13
1963-64	7,731	53	.69	4,305	45	1.05	12,036	98	.81

*Official Fall Enrollment

Table 4

Breakdown Of Offenses Committed

Offenses	Number of Times Committed	Percent of Total Sample
Alcohol	206	22.0
Dishonesty	7	0.7
Falsification	153	15.8
Property Destruction	11	1.2
Theft	224	23.9
Unlawful Assembly	2	0.2
Traffic	24	2.6
Breaking and Entering	4	0.4
Disturbance	22	2.3
Sexual	13	1.4
Fire Regulations	4	0.4
Gambling	12	1.3
Drugs	5	0.5
Hours	200	21.3
Men/Women in Halls	9	1.0
Keeping Girl Out All Night	10	1.1
Violating Residence Hall Rules	11	1.2
Forgery	7	0.7
Violating Postal Laws	4	0.4
Charged With Capital Crime (Murder)	2	0.2
Lewdness	1	0.1
Missuse of Draft Card	2	0.2
Check Fraud-Worthless Checks	3	0.3
Threatening Letter	1	0.1

Table 5

Description Of Sample With University

Overall Percentages As Comparison

	Male		Female		Total		Overall %
Name	#	%	#	%	#	%	1967 - 68
Sex	549	58.5	389	41.5	938	100	Male - 60.8 Female-39.2
College							
Agricultural Sciences	48	8.7	4	1.0	52	5.5	6.5
Arts & Sciences	170	31.0	191	49.1	361	38.5	32.7
Business Administration	204	37.2	54	13.9	258	27.5	22.5
Engineering	116	21.1	8	2.1	124	13.2	12.2
Home Economics	1	0.2	76	19.5	77	8.2	7.1
Education	4	0.7	56	14.4	60	6.4	7.6
Graduate School	6	1.1	0	0.0	6	0.6	11.2
Year In School							
Freshman	307	55.9	226	58.1	533	56.8	34.9
Sophomore	121	22.0	93	23.9	214	22.8	21.3
Junior	76	13.8	48	12.3	124	13.2	18.2
Senior	39	7.1	22	5.6	61	6.5	14.1
Graduate	6	1.1	0	0.0	6	0.6	11.2
Method Of Entry							
From High School	446	81.2	323	83.0	769	82.0	73.4*
From Junior College	46	8.4	22	5.7	68	7.2	10.3*
From 4-Year College	57	10.4	44	11.3	101	10.8	15.6*
Home State							
Texas	503	91.6	368	94.6	871	92.9	93.7
Out Of State	46	8.4	21	5.4	67	7.1	5.7

*Percentages are on entering students the Fall of 1968.

Table 6

Description Of Sample

	Male		Female		Total	
Name	#	%	#	%	#	%
Marital Status						
Single	543	98.9	385	99.0	928	98.9
Married	6	1.1	4	1.0	10	1.1
Residence						
Dormitory	357	65.0	349	89.7	706	75.3
In Town	143	26.0	31	8.0	174	18.6
With Parents	43	7.8	8	2.1	51	5.4
With Spouse	6	1.1	1	0.3	7	0.7
Number Involved						
One	268	48.8	319	82.0	587	62.6
More Than One	281	51.2	70	18.0	351	37.4
School Session						
Regular	537	97.8	365	93.8	902	96.2
Summer	12	2.2	24	6.2	36	3.8
Socio-Economic Scale						
Professional	194	35.3	154	39.6	348	37.1
Skilled	272	49.5	184	47.3	456	48.6
Unskilled	20	3.6	7	1.8	27	2.9
Unknown, Retired, Deceased	63	11.5	44	11.3	107	11.4
Action Taken						
Probation	359	65.4	286	73.5	645	68.8
Suspension	190	34.6	103	26.5	293	31.2

Table 7

Disciplinary Offenders' Grade Point Average And Institutional Grade Point Average By College, Class and Sex*

College	Overall GPA	Offenders' GPA
Agricultural Sciences	2.13	1.48
Arts and Sciences	2.33	1.50
Business Administration	2.08	1.54
Engineering	2.14	1.51
Home Economics	2.52	1.65
Education	2.54	2.08
Class	**Overall GPA**	**Offenders' GPA**
Freshman	1.99	1.35
Sophomore	2.26	1.70
Junior	2.40	1.84
Senior	2.72	2.32
Sex	**Overall GPA**	**Offenders' GPA**
Male	2.10	1.48
Female	2.52	1.70
Total	2.27	1.57

*Fall semester, 1968, grade point average is used for comparative purposes with the six year semester grade point average.

Table 8

Breakdown Of Offenses By Month

Month	Number	Percent
January	76	8.1
February	137	14.6
March	128	13.6
April	80	8.5
May	185	19.7
June	16	1.7
July	26	2.8
August	11	1.2
September	14	1.5
October	118	12.6
November	79	8.4
December	68	7.2

available only ACT scores and these were interpolated into SAT scores.

When all the data had been collected it was key punched for computer analysis. A T-test and factor analysis were made on each of these seven variables: sex, year in school, college, accumulative grade point average, CEEB-SAT total scores, offense and action taken. A factor analysis was made for the total sample. Frequency counts and percentages were obtained for certain variables and descriptive data.

A detailed analysis of the sample and various tables referred to can be found in the appendix.

SUMMARY

Total Sample

The total sample of students consisted of 938 disciplinary cases. The sample, with an average age of 19 years 5 months and average year in school of slightly below sophomore, tended more toward male students (Table 12). Mean accumulative grade point average was 1.72; mean semester grade point average was 1.57, and the average load was 14 hours a semester.

The number involved in the offense tended toward the individual rather than the group. The average socio-economic conditions of the students' families were just above the skilled occupation level. Average action taken for the total sample tended toward probation.

Correlations which were significant among the twelve variables involved were reported in Table 11. The correlations of variables that were significant were expected because of the type of variable involved. Generally speaking, these were such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point averages, and 3) entrance tests scores.

The factor analysis for the total sample revealed two general clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance tests scores, and 2) such personal data as year in school and age (Table 8).

Male and Female Samples

The T-test revealed that the comparison of age of male and female students was significant--males being about 19 1/2 years and females being 19 1/6 years (Table 23). The year in school was just below sophomore for both and was not significantly different. In both accumulative and semester grade point averages the female students had higher grade point averages than the males. The female students took significantly more semester hours than did male students.

The two groups were significantly different on all three CEEB scores. Female students scored higher on the verbal test and the male students scored higher on the math and total scores. Comparison of the male and female student offenders' CEEB math and verbal scores with the 1968 entering freshmen scores indicates that the student disciplinary offenders scored only slightly lower than the 1968 entering freshmen. The comparison is as follows:

	Male		Female	
Entrance Test	All-Students	Dis. Offenders	All-Students	Dis. Offenders
Verbal	457	425	458	445
Math	503	484	457	440

There were significantly more group offenses among male students than female. The socio-economic scale did not vary significantly between these two groups--both being just above the skilled level. The two groups differed significantly in regard to action taken. Male students received suspension more often than did female students.

For both the male and female samples, a high degree of relationship was found in only five areas. These areas included such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point averages, and 3) entrance test scores. All of these related as would be expected (Tables 17 and 22).

The factor analysis for male students revealed two major clusters with commonalities related to 1) high entrance test scores and high accumulative grade point averages, and 2) such personal data as year in school and age (Table 14). The factor analysis for female students disclosed two clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores and accumulative grade point averages, and 2) year in school, age and semester grade point averages (Table 19).

CEEB-Total Scores

The mean for the CEEB total scores was 897. The total sample was divided into two groups for comparison purposes--those above and those below the mean. There were 443 subjects below the mean and 495 subjects above the mean.

There was no significant difference between sex; however, age was significantly different. The older subjects were in the group above the mean. Accumulative and semester grade point averages were both significantly different for these groups. As would be expected, the higher grade point averages were in the above the mean group. The above the mean group carried significantly more semester hours.

For both the above mean and below mean groups, a high degree of relationship was found in only four areas. All these areas included the expected relationships of such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point averages, and 3) entrance test scores (Tables 28 and 33).

The factor analysis for students with total CEEB scores below the mean revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) such personal data as year in school and age, 2) low entrance test scores, and 3) high entrance test scores (Table 25). There were also three clusters revealed in the above the mean group. These commonalities related to 1) such personal data as year in school and age, 2) entrance test scores and accumulative grade point average, and 3) entrance test scores and male students (Table 30).

Classification

The total sample was divided into the four classifications of freshman, sophomore, junior and senior for the purpose of comparison. The N for each class was as follows: 533 freshmen, 214 sophomores, 124 juniors, and 61 seniors. It was revealed that freshmen differed significantly from each of the other classes in three areas. Freshmen were younger and their accumulative and semester grade point averages were lower (Tables 55, 56, and 57). Sophomores and juniors differed only in age (Table 59). Sophomores and seniors differed significantly in age, and accumulative and semester grade point averages--the sophomores' grades being lower (Table 58). Junior and senior students were significantly different when compared on the basis of age, and accumulative and semester grade point averages. Junior students had lower grade point averages (Table 60).

For freshmen, sophomores and juniors, a high degree of relationship was found in only four areas. These areas included such variables as 1) grade point averages and 2) entrance test scores. These related as would be expected (Tables 39, 44 and 49). For the senior sample, a high degree of relationship was found in only three areas. These areas included such variables as 1) grade point averages and 2) entrance test scores (Table 54).

The factor analysis for freshmen revealed two major clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, and 2) semester and accumulative grade point averages and male students (Table 36). For sophomores there were two clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores and 2) accumulative and semester grade point averages, CEEB verbal scores and male students (Table 41). The two clusters within the junior student sample had commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores and 2) accumulative and semester grade point averages and female students (Table 46). The factor analysis for seniors revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) accumulative and semester grade point averages and younger female students, and 3) academic load and socio-economic scale (Table 51).

College

The students were divided into their six undergraduate colleges and each of these colleges was compared to the other on the twelve variables. The N for each college was as follows: Agricultural Sciences - 52, Arts and Sciences - 361, Business Administration - 258, Engineering - 124, Home Economics - 77, and Education - 60. The CEEB math and total scores for the College of Engineering were significantly higher than any other college (Tables 93, 97, 99, 101, and 104). Engineering students had CEEB verbal scores significantly higher than those in Business Administration. Engineering differed significantly on the variable of sex from Education, Home Economics, Business Administration, and Arts and Sciences. These same colleges were significantly different from the College of Engineering on the variable concerning the number involved in the offense. This last variable was usually dependent upon the male-female ratio. In the case of the College of Engineering, it had significantly more male students and more offenses committed by them were done as a group rather than as individuals.

The College of Education and the College of Home Economics did not differ significantly on any of the variables (Table 105). The College of Education had significantly more female students and were significantly lower in the number involved in the offense than were the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Arts and Sciences, and Business Administration

(Tables 92, 102, and 103). Education also had significantly higher semester grade point averages than did Arts and Sciences and Business Administration.

When compared to the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Home Economics, the College of Business Administration differed significantly in that it had fewer female students and more offenses committed as a group (Tables 94 and 98). Business Administration also differed from Arts and Sciences on the CEEB verbal test. Arts and Sciences students scored significantly higher on the verbal test than did students in Business Administration. The students in the College of Agricultural Sciences took significantly more semester hours than did the students in the College of Business Administration (Table 100).

The Colleges of Home Economics and Agricultural Sciences differed significantly on two variables (Table 96). There were significantly more female students and fewer group offenses in the College of Home Economics. Home Economics had significantly more female students and lower CEEB total scores than Arts and Sciences (Table 95). The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Agricultural Sciences differed significantly in that Arts and Sciences had more female students and fewer group offenses (Table 91).

For the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration and Engineering, a high degree of relationship was found in five areas. These areas included such variables as 1) entrance test scores, 2) grade point averages, and 3) year in school and age (Tables 70, 75 and 80). The College of Business Administration also showed some relationship between CEEB total scores and accumulative grade point average. The College of Arts and Sciences showed a relationship between CEEB verbal and total scores with accumulative grade point average.

For the College of Agricultural Sciences, a high degree of relationship was found in five areas which included such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point average, and 3) entrance test scores (Table 65). Three areas were found to have a high degree of relationship for the College of Home Economics. These areas included the same variables as mentioned above (Table 85). For the College of Education, a high degree of relationship was found in five areas which again included the same variables as mentioned above (Table 90). All of these variables related as would be expected.

The factor analysis for the College of Agricultural Sciences revealed three major clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) grade point averages, academic load and action taken, and 3) such personal data as year in school and age (Table 62). The factor analysis for the College of Arts and Sciences disclosed three general clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) age and year in school, and 3) grade point averages and female students (Table 67). The factor analysis for the College of Business Administration showed two major clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, and 2) age and year in school (Table 72). The factor analysis for the College of Engineering showed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) such personal data as year in school and age, and 3) verbal entrance test scores and male students (Table 77). The factor analysis for the College of Home Economics revealed three major clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) such personal data as year in school and age, and 3) grade point averages and academic load (Table 82). The factor analysis for the College of Education showed three major clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) age and year in school, and 3) grade point averages (Table 87).

Accumulative Grade Point Average

The mean for the accumulative grade point for the total sample was 1.72. The total sample was divided into two groups--below the mean and above the mean. The two groups differed significantly on almost all of the variables (Table 116). Those in the group above the mean were older and, in turn, had a higher classification. Those above the mean had higher semester grade point averages and carried more semester hours. The socio-economic level was significantly higher for those in the above mean group.

For the above mean group, a high degree of relationship was found in five areas. All these areas included the expected relationships of such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point averages, and 3) entrance test scores (Table 110). For the below mean group, a high degree of relationship was found in four areas which included such variables as 1) year in school and age, and 2) entrance test scores (Table 115).

The factor analysis for students with accumulative grade point average above the mean revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores and male students, 2) such personal data as year in school and age, and 3) entrance test data and female students (Table 107). The factor analysis for the below mean group revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) such personal data as year in school and age, and 3) number involved in the offense and male students (Table 112).

Offenses

The breakdown of offenses committed revealed four offenses each of which had been committed more than 100 times. These offenses were as follows: alcohol - 206, falsification - 153, hours - 200, theft - 224. Table 137 showed the comparison of students involved in an hours offense and those involved in a falsification offense. They differed significantly in age, sex, and year in school. The hours offense included only female students and these students tended to be younger and of a lower classification. The comparison of falsification offense with the alcohol and theft offense is shown in Tables 138 and 142. In both cases the students involved in the falsification offense were more often females who were older and the offense was committed more often as an individual. The disciplinary action for a falsification offense was more often probation than was the action for the theft offense. The action was, however, more often suspension for the falsification offense than for the alcohol offense. The action taken for a falsification offense was more often suspension than was the action for an alcohol offense. Table 139 showed the comparison of students involved in an alcohol offense and students involved in a theft offense. Those students having committed a theft offense were of a significantly lower socioeconomic level and more often were suspended. These same differences were significant when the theft and hours offenses were compared (Table 140). In addition, there were significantly more female students involved in hours offenses than theft offenses and their offenses were more often committed as individuals. The accumulative and semester grade point averages were significantly higher for those students involved in an hours offense and these same students' verbal entrance test score was significantly higher than those involved in a theft offense. Table 141 compared the students involved in hours offenses and those involved in alcohol offenses. They differed significantly on the variables of sex, math entrance test scores, number involved in the offense and disciplinary action taken. Those students having committed an alcohol offense tended more toward male students, had higher math entrance test scores, committed the offense more often as a group, and received probation more often than did those students involved in an hours offense.

Tables 121, 126, 131 and 136 reported the correlations which were statistically significant for all four offenses. A high degree of relationship was found in five areas for all samples. All these areas included the expected relationships of such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point averages, and 3) entrance test scores. In addition, for the falsification offense sample, a relationship was shown between disciplinary action taken and the sex of the students. For the sample of students involved in an alcohol offense, there was a relationship between the sex of the student and the number involved in the offense as well as the sex of the student and the disciplinary action taken. A relationship between entrance test scores and accumulative grade point average was noted for the sample of students having committed an hours offense.

The factor analysis for students involved in an hours offense revealed two clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test data, and 2) grade point averages and personal data such as year in school and age (Table 118). The factor analysis for students involved in a theft offense revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) personal data such as year in school and age, and 3) accumulative and semester grade point averages (Table 123). Three clusters were revealed in the factor analysis for students having committed a falsification offense. The commonalities of these clusters related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) personal data such as year in school and age, and 3) accumulative and semester grade point averages (Table 128). The factor analysis for students involved in an alcohol offense revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores and semester grade point average, 2) personal data such as year in school and age, and 3) the sex of the students, disciplinary action taken and the number involved in the offense (Table 133).

Disciplinary Action

The total sample was divided into two groups depending upon rather probation or suspension was the disciplinary action received. There were 293 in the suspension sample and 645 in the probation sample. In comparing these two groups, it was shown that they differed significantly in three areas. The probation group tended more toward female students and had higher accumulative and semester grade point averages (Table 153).

A high degree of relationship was found for both groups in five areas when they were correlated. The five areas included the expected relationships of such variables as 1) year in school and age, 2) grade point averages, and 3) entrance test scores. In addition, there was a relationship between the sex of the student and the number involved in the offense for the probation group. A relationship was shown between verbal and total entrance test scores and accumulative grade point average for the suspension group (Tables 147 and 152).

The factor analysis for the students given probation revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance tests, 2) age and year in school, and 3) the sex of the students and the number involved in the offense (Table 144). The factor analysis for students given suspension revealed three clusters with commonalities related to 1) entrance test scores, 2) personal data such as year in school and age, and 3) accumulative grade point average and academic load (Table 149).

CONCLUSIONS

The six year discipline study at Texas Tech University produced findings that, for the most part, were expected. The percent of offenses committed by male and female students was compatible with their percent of enrollment at the University. Freshmen had considerably more than their share of disciplinary offenses. The freshman class represented 35% of the total campus enrollment and members of this class constituted 57% of the offenses. The percent of offenses by sophomores was nearly the same as its percent of the total enrollment. Junior, senior and graduate students committed fewer offenses than their percent of enrollment could have claimed. The Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Business Administration had 6% and 5% respectively higher rate of disciplinary offenders than their percent of enrollment would indicate. In other colleges, except for Graduate School, the percent of offenders aligned closely with their percent enrollment. The Graduate School had a considerably lower rate of offenses than their percent enrollment.

Male students committed only 37% of their offenses as individuals whereas 63% of the offenses involving female students were committed as individuals as opposed to a group. Over twice as many of the offenses committed were of the severity to receive a penalty of probation rather than suspension. Grade point averages of offenders were considerably and consistently lower than the all-campus grade point averages. More offenses were committed in the spring semester and generally they tended to cluster at the beginning of the semesters and at the end of the academic year.

This study and its results could provide helpful information in the area of discipline at Texas Tech. More importantly, it should provide the incentive for future studies utilizing these findings.

STUDENT DISCIPLINE

A REVIEW OF RECENT DISCIPLINARY STUDIES

Few areas of university administration have caused more concern, been more frustrating, and consumed more time and energy than the perennial problem of student discipline. In spite of this fact, literature concerning philosophies of discipline and descriptive research studies is far from adequate.

Over the years, administration of discipline on the college campus has run the gamut from punitive practices administered mainly by presidents of institutions to the now prevalent educational-counseling approach by student personnel staff. Dr. Thomas A. Brady, former Dean of Extra-divisional Administration at the University of Missouri perceived discipline as an integral part of the educational process and emphasized student discipline as a means of stimulating a student to achieve maturity and motivation for learning on the college level. In his monograph in the Student Personnel Series, Dr. Brady attempted to show the following:

> . . . that administration of student discipline is not only an important aspect of the educational process but that it relates closely to the teaching program and has important bearing on success in educating many of the students who come to us. In a college community, so closely knit and tightly packed, administration of discipline has an important effect on students that never, themselves, appear in the disciplinary process. There is hardly a student in a college population who has not been associated with some other student who has, sometime in his college career, come into contact with disciplinary procedures. . . The college-student age is an impressionable age at which example and leadership by friends and associates are strong influences. (1)

In his discussion of college discipline, DeSena believes that three main philosophies are prevalent in the handling of discipline at the college level:

1. Pure Intellectualism Philosophy - relieves the institution from responsibility for training of its students in social, moral, and ethical areas except through subject matter courses.
2. Legalistic Philosophy - discipline is legislative and punitive. The interests of the institution are paramount and the interests of the individual are minimized.
3. Personalism Philosophy - discipline becomes a part of the educational pattern. It places the burden of providing needed social, moral, and ethical training squarely on the institution. The interests of the individual become paramount and a search is made for reasons behind behavior. (3)

In so far as actual practice in most institutions is concerned, a combination of or some middle ground among the three disciplinary philosophies is usually adopted.

With the many social changes and the emergence of the "new morality," static disciplinary procedures and programs of punitive action "by the book" are no longer acceptable policies in universities. This poses the task of continual revision of student conduct codes and the ever present difficulty of balancing standardization and individualization of discipline. Murphy and Hanna (8) speak of this problem: "In the administration of student affairs one of the more perplexing problems is the application of disciplinary measures to student conduct with some semblance of standardization and simultaneous individualization."

In structuring and revising a university discipline code of conduct, it would appear important to understand the students' views and general opinions in regard to standards of conduct. Hodinko, in a 1957 study at The Pennsylvania State University, found a number of differences among students regarding standards of conduct. These differences seemed to vary according to the age, sex, and college class of the individuals in question. Five hundred twenty students ranked conduct offenses according to the degree of censure they expressed toward the individual committing each.

> An examination of these data suggests that in the opinion of students, standards which severely condemn acts of theft for the material value of an article and cheating involving collusion were most appropriate. On the other hand, student opinion was indicative of little support of strong policies against the use of alcoholic beverages. (4)

Older students and upper classmen revealed a stronger disapproval of misbehavior with more serious implications (theft, malicious destruction, false fire alarm, predesigned cheating) than did younger and lower classmen.

There is a definite lack of empirical studies concerning the characteristics and personality patterns of the students involved in disciplinary actions. Brady's (1) comment on research activity in the area of discipline is appropriate: "Here is an academic wasteland so far as study and research are concerned." The reasons for the lack of descriptive studies are not clear. Tisdale and Brown (9) suggested that possible reluctance on the part of some college administrators to make such information public may be a factor.

In the middle 1960's, Tisdale and Brown's study at Iowa State University investigated whether students in trouble during any given academic year are characterized by common factors in their backgrounds and college records that tend to distinguish them from other students. The discipline group from the academic year 1961-62 was composed of 130 subjects whose mean age was 20 and 81% of whom were between 19 and 21. A control group of 200 was randomly selected. The offenses were spread fairly evenly throughout the year except for the spring quarter which had higher relative numbers. The total number of disciplinary offenders accounted for about 1.28% of the University enrollment for that year.

The classification of offenses contained seven catagories: academic dishonesty, alcohol violation, automobile violation, disorderly conduct, misuse of privileges or fraud, theft, and miscellaneous. The most frequent offense was theft, followed by disorderly conduct, alcohol violations, privilege misuse or fraud, and a miscellaneous category. The action most frequently taken in the disciplinary cases was to place the offender on conduct probation for a stated period of time, which was the penalty in over half of the cases. A verbal warning was next most frequent, with a formal written reprimand third. Ten students were suspended from the University, no action was taken on six and six were referred for counseling. The sample, consisting of 119 males and 11 females, was significantly different from the all-university distribution and indicated a disproportionate number of males.

There was a significant difference among colleges of the University in the number of students contributed to the sample. Home Economics and the Graduate College were underrepresented, while the College of Engineering and the College of Sciences and Humanities were overrepresented. There was also a significant difference among the classes of the University in the discipline sample. Of the undergraduate students, it was the freshmen who were overrepresented, the others being in proportion. Students living off-campus were proportionately represented in the misconduct group while those living in dormitories were underrepresented in the student body as a whole, and those living in fraternity and sorority houses were overrepresented.

In follow-up studies made in June of 1964, it was found that of those students who were no longer in school, 48.5% of the control group had graduated versus 28.5% of the misconduct group. To some degree, the size of the high school graduating class emerged as a significant factor. In general, the smaller the graduating class the less well it was represented in the misconduct group. When the misconduct sample and the control group were compared in terms of high school and college grades, there was no significant difference, although there seemed to have been a trend for the misconduct group to be making lower grades than usual for them or the University as a whole in the quarters prior to and during the appearance. (9)

In a study completed at the University of Minnesota (10), the misconduct sample was equal to less than 2% of the student population. There were more men than women and there was a higher representation from the University Arts College and lower from the Graduate College. There was no difference between the discipline and control group in ACE scores and academic achievement.

LeMay and Murphy (7) of Oregon State University carried out a study of male discipline referrals using the MMPI. They compared the discipline group (N=70) with a control group (N=70) on the various scales of the MMPI. They found that the MMPI mean scores of alcohol misconduct and disorderly conduct offenders were significantly different from the control group on the Psychopathic Deviate and Hypomania Scales. Any interpretation of data from this study must take into consideration the small number of subjects in the sample and the fact that interpretation of group means is not necessarily considered valid.

A discipline study was performed at Kansas State University (5) involving 59 male residence hall disciplinary offenders. A randomly selected control group of equal size, who were residents of the same hall, was used for comparative purposes. Data (30 factors) was obtained from various records and offices at the University. A significant difference in intellectual factors was found when the two groups were compared on college and high school grade point averages. The experimental group was deemed lower in both potential and performance. The curricula chosen differed significantly. Agriculture and engineering were disproportionately represented in the control group, while general, biological science, social science, physical education, and participation in varsity athletics were significantly disproportionately represented in the disciplinary group. Age was not a distinguishing factor because the dormitory housed predominately freshmen and sophomores.

Work (11) reports a discipline study done at Ohio University using undergraduate male students. The discipline group consisted of 66 male students who had been involved in incidents leading to disciplinary warning, probation, or suspension. The control group was composed of 66 undergraduate male residence hall floor counselors. The two groups were matched on age and ability. The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was administered to both groups and the groups were compared on each of the 18 scales. The discipline group was significantly higher than the control group in Class 1 scales on the "social presence" scale indicating that this group was spontaneous and had an expressive, ebullient nature. In the Class 2 scales, the discipline group showed marked deficiencies as they scored significantly below the comparison groups on such scales as "responsibility," "socialization," "self-control," "tolerance," and "good expression." In the Class 3 scales, the discipline group scored significantly lower on the scales of "achievement via conformance" and "achievement via independence." According to Work, "the discipline group could be seen as being easily disorganized under stress or pressure, pessimistic about their occupational future, and lacking in insight and self-understanding." The Class 4 scales revealed a significant difference on the "flexibility" scale. The discipline group scored higher indicating concern for personal pleasure and diversion and as being assertive and egoistic.

A study was conducted by Cummins (2) at Michigan State University in an attempt to differentiate potential disciplinary offenders from non-offenders on certain affective measures. The "Inventory of Beliefs," Rokeach's "Dogmatism Scale," and the "Differential Values Inventory" were administered to the entering freshman class in the fall term, 1958. Disciplinary information was gathered at the end of the students' four years. Those referred for disciplinary action included 95 males and 49 females. This group was matched with a non-disciplinary group with similar academic ability and socio-economic status. Male and female subjects were analyzed separately. The hypotheses were that disciplinary offenders would tend to be more flexible, less dogmatic, and hold more emergent value systems than non-offenders. The results of this study rejected those hypotheses as the differences between the groups were minimal, with the exception that female offenders differed significantly from non-offenders in the direction predicted with regard to value orientation.

From this review of the research reported on discipline, it appears that much more extensive studies need to be performed. For the most part, the samples used in these studies were too small to be very significant, and the span of one academic year is insufficient to establish an accurate picture of disciplinary trends and personal characteristics. In reviewing college disciplinary problems, LeMay (6) made several suggestions concerning future research:

> Male and female offenders should be studied separately since research has shown the importance of sex differences. Descriptive studies should also control for the type offense committed since research has shown differences between studies grouped according to their offense. . .a descriptive study should cover at least a five or six year period.

Reviewing the literature, it would appear that a few characteristics of the discipline group are similar. In most studies, the misconduct group is overrepresented by males and younger, lower classmen. In two studies no significant differences were found concerning academic achievement, however, the Kansas State study conflicts with this finding. The Michigan State and Ohio State studies are in conflict in regard to the flexibility of the discipline sample. Little that is conclusive can be stated from these studies because of the various weaknesses inherent in them due to small samples and the short span of time over which the studies were made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brady, Thomas A. and Snoxell, L. F., Student Discipline in Higher Education, Student Personnel Series No. 5, Washington, D. C., The American College Personnel Association, 1965.

2. Cummins, Emery J., "Are Disciplinary Students Different?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XLIV, No. 6, February, 1966.

3. DeSena, Paul A., "Constructive Discipline Through Student Courts," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. VI, No. 3, March, 1965.

4. Hodinko, Bernard A., "A Study of Student Opinion Regarding Collegiate Discipline Situations," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. V, No. 4, June, 1964.

5. Kaiser, Herbert E., and Britton, Gale, "Intellective and Non-Intellective Characteristics of Students Involved in Dormitory Discipline Problems," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. VIII, No. 6, November, 1967.

6. LeMay, Morris, "College Disciplinary Problems: A Review," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. IX, No. 3, May, 1968.

7. LeMay, Morris, and Murphy, Thomas A., "MMPI Patterns of College Male Disciplinary Referrals," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. VIII, No. 2, March, 1967.

8. Murphy, Raymond O., and Hanna, Nickolas, "Campus Views of Male Student Conduct," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. VI, No. 2, December, 1964.

9. Tisdale, John R. and Brown, Frederick G., "Characteristics of College Misconduct Cases," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. VI, No. 6, November, 1965.

10. Williamson, E. G., Jorve, W., and Lagerstadt-Knudson, Barbara, "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?" Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. XII, 1952.

11. Work, Gerald G., "CPI Patterns of College Male Disciplinary Cases and a Comparison Group," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. X, No. 4, July, 1969.

APPENDIX

Contents	Page
A. List of Tables	i - x
B. Tables 1 through 153	1 - 110

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Breakdown by Year of Disciplinary Action Taken . . . 2

Table 2. Number and Percent of Offenses Committed for Total Sample by Academic Year. 3

Table 2a. Enrollment by Year and Number of Offenses. 4

Table 3. Description of Sample with University Overall Percentages as Comparison. 5

Table 4. Description of Sample. 6

Table 4a. Disciplinary Offenders' Grade Point Average and Institutional Grade Point Average by College, Class and Sex. 7

Table 5. Breakdown of Offenses Committed. 8

Table 6. Breakdown of Offenses by Month 9

Table 7. Extracted Variance for Total Sample of Students. . . 10

Table 8. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Total Sample of Students (N = 938) 10

Table 9. Factor Intercorrelations for Total Sample of Students 10

Table 10. Correlations of All Variables for Total Sample of Students (N = 938) 11

Table 11. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Total Sample of Students (N = 938) 12

Table 12. Mean and Standard Deviation for Total Sample of Students (N = 938) 13

Table 13. Extracted Variance for Male Students 14

Table 14. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Male Students (N = 549) 14

Table 15. Factor Intercorrelations for Male Students 14

Table 16. Correlations of All Variables for Male Students (N = 549). 15

Table 17. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Male Students (N = 549) 16

Table 18. Extracted Variance for Female Students 17

Table 19. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Female Students (N = 378) 17

Table 20. Factor Intercorrelations for Female Students 17

Table 21. Correlations of All Variables for Female Students (N = 389). 18

Table 22. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Female Students (N = 389). 19

Table 23. A Comparison of Male and Female Students 20

Table 24. Extracted Variance for Students with Total CEEB Scores Below Mean. 21

Table 25. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students with Total CEEB Scores Below Mean. 21

Table 26. Ractor Intercorrelations for Students with Total CEEB Scores Below Mean 21

Table 27. Correlations of All Variables for Students with Total CEEB Scores Below Mean (N = 443) 22

Table 28. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students with Total CEEB Scores Below Mean (N= 443). 23

Table 29. Extracted Variance for Students with Total CEEB Scores Above Mean. 24

Table 30. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students with Total CEEB Scores Above Mean (N = 495). 24

Table 31. Factor Intercorrelations for Students with Total CEEB Scores Above Mean 24

Table 32. Correlations of All Variables for Students with Total CEEB Scores Above Mean (N = 495) 25

Table 33. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students with Total CEEB Scores Above Mean (N= 495). 26

Table 34. A Comparison of Students with Total CEEB Scores Below the Mean and Students with Total CEEB Scores Above the Mean (Mean = 897). 27

Table 35. Extracted Variance for Freshmen Students 28

Table 36. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Freshmen Students (N = 533) 28

Table 37. Factor Intercorrelations for Freshmen Students . . . 28

Table 38. Correlations of All Variables for Freshmen Students (N = 533). 29

Table 39. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Freshmen Students (N = 533). 30

Table 40. Extracted Variance for Sophomore Students. 31

Table 41. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Sophomore Students (N = 214) 31

Table 42. Factor Intercorrelations for Sophomore Students. . . 31

Table 43. Correlations of All Variables for Sophomore Students (N = 214) 32

Table 44. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Sophomore Students (N = 214) 33

Table 45. Extracted Variance for Junior Students 34

Table 46. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Junior Students (N = 124) 34

Table 47. Factor Intercorrelations for Junior Students 34

Table 48. Correlations of All Variables for Junior Students (N = 124). 35

Table 49. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Junior Students (N = 124). 36

Table 50. Extracted Variance for Senior Students 37

Table 51. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Senior Students (N = 61). 37

Table 52. Factor Intercorrelations for Senior Students 37

Table 53. Correlations of All Variables for Senior Students (N = 61) 38

Table 54. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Senior Students (N = 61) 39

Table 55. A Comparison of Sophomore Students and Freshmen Students 40

Table 56. A Comparison of Junior Students and Freshmen Students 41

Table 57. A Comparison of Senior Students and Freshmen Students 42

Table 58. A Comparison of Senior Students and Sophomore Students 43

Table 59. A Comparison of Junior Students and Sophomore Students 44

Table 60. A Comparison of Senior Students and Junior Students. 45

Table 61. Extracted Variance for Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences 46

Table 62. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences (N = 52) . . 46

Table 63. Factor Intercorrelations for Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences 46

Table 64. Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences (N = 52). 47

Table 65. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences . . 48

Table 66. Extracted Variance for Students in the College of Arts and Sciences 49

Table 67. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students in the College of Arts and Sciences (N = 361). . . . 49

Table 68. Factor Intercorrelations for Students in the College of Arts and Sciences 49

Table 69. Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Arts and Sciences (N = 361) 50

Table 70. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Arts and Sciences (N = 361). 51

Table 71. Extracted Variance for Students in the College of Business Administration 52

Table 72. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students in the College of Business Administration (N = 258). 52

Table 73. Factor Intercorrelations for Students in the College of Business Administration 52

Table 74. Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Business Administration (N = 258) 53

Table 75. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Business Administration (N = 258). 54

Table 76. Extracted Variance for Students in the College of Engineering. 55

Table 77. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students in the College of Engineering (N = 124). 55

Table 78. Factor Intercorrelations for Students in the College of Engineering 55

Table 79. Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Engineering (N = 124) 56

Table 80. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Engineering (N = 124) . . 57

Table 81. Extracted Variance for Students in the College of Home Economics 58

Table 82. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students in the College of Home Economics (N = 77). 58

Table 83. Factor Intercorrelations for Students in the College of Home Economics. 58

Table 84. Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Home Economics (N = 77) 59

Table 85. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Home Economics (N = 77) . 60

Table 86. Extracted Variance for Students in the College of Education. 61

Table 87. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students in the College of Education (N = 60). . . . 61

Table 88. Factor Intercorrelations for Students in the College of Education 61

Table 89. Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Education (N = 60). 62

Table 90. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students in the College of Education (N = 60). . . . 63

Table 91. A Comparison of Students in the College of Arts and Sciences and Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences. 64

Table 92. A Comparison of Students in the College of Education and Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences 65

Table 93. A Comparison of Students in the College of Home Economics and Students in the College of Engineering. 66

Table 94. A Comparison of Students in the College of Home Economics and Students in the College of Business Administration 67

Table 95. A Comparison of Students in the College of Arts and Sciences and Students in the College of Home Economics. 68

Table 96. A Comparison of Students in the College of Home Economics and Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences 69

Table 97. A Comparison of Students in the College of Business Administration and Students in the College of Engineering. 70

Table 98. A Comparison of Students in the College of Business Administration and Students in the College of Arts and Sciences 71

Table 99. A Comparison of Students in the College of Arts and Sciences and Students in the College of Engineering. 72

Table 100. A Comparison of Students in the College of Business Administration and Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences. 73

Table 101. A Comparison of Students in the College of Engineering and Students in the College of Agricultural Sciences. 74

Table 102. A Comparison of Students in the College of Education and Students in the College of Arts and Sciences . . 75

Table 103. A Comparison of Students in the College of Education and Students in the College of Business Administation 76

Table 104. A Comparison of Students in the College of Education and Students in the College of Engineering 77

Table 105. A Comparison of Students in the College of Education and Students in the College of Home Economics. . . . 78

Table 106. Extracted Variance for Students with Accumulated GPA Above the Mean 79

Table 107. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students with Accumulated GPA Above Mean (N = 378). 79

Table 108. Factor Intercorrelations for Students with Accumulated GPA Above the Mean 79

Table 109. Correlations of All Variables for Students with Accumulated GPA Above Mean (N = 378) 80

Table 110. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students with Accumulated GPA Above Mean (N = 378) . 81

Table 111. Extracted Variance for Students with Accumulated GPA Below the Mean 82

Table 112. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students with Accumulated GPA Below Mean (N = 560). 82

Table 113. Factor Intercorrelations for Students with Accumulated GPA Below the Mean 82

Table 114. Correlations of All Variables for Students with Accumulated GPA Below Mean (N = 560) 83

Table 115. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students with Accumulated GPA Below Mean (N = 560) . 84

Table 116. A Comparison of Students with Accumulated GPA Above the Mean and Students with Accumulated GPA Below the Mean on Twelve Selected Variables (Mean = 1.72). 85

Table 117. Extracted Variance for Students Having Committed an Hours Offense 86

Table 118. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students Having Committed an Hours Offense (N = 200). 86

Table 119. Factor Intercorrelations for Students Having Committed an Hours Offense 86

Table 120. Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed an Hours Offense (N = 200) 87

Table 121. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed an Hours Offense (N = 200). 88

Table 122. Extracted Variance for Students Having Committed a Theft Offense. 89

Table 123. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students Having Committed a Theft Offense (N = 224) 89

Table 124. Factor Intercorrelations for Students Having Committed a Theft Offense. 89

Table 125. Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed a Theft Offense (N = 224). 90

Table 126. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed a Theft Offense (N = 224). 91

Table 127. Extracted Variance for Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense. 92

Table 128. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense (N = 153) . 92

Table 129. Factor Intercorrelations for Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense. 92

Table 130. Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense (N = 153). 93

Table 131. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense (N = 153). 94

Table 132. Extracted Variance for Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense 95

Table 133. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense (N = 206). . . . 95

Table 134. Factor Intercorrelations for Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense 95

Table 135. Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense (N = 206) 96

Table 136. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense (N = 206). 97

Table 137. A Comparison of Students Having Committed an Hours Offense and Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense 98

Table 138. A Comparison of Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense and Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense. 99

Table 139. A Comparison of Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense and Students Having Committed a Theft Offense. 100

Table 140. A Comparison of Students Having Committed an Hours Offense and Students Having Committed a Theft Offense. 101

Table 141. A Comparison of Students Having Committed an Hours Offense and Students Having Committed an Alcohol Offense. 102

Table 142. A Comparison of Students Having Committed a Theft Offense and Students Having Committed a Falsification Offense 103

Table 143. Extracted Variance for Students Given Probation. . . 104

Table 144. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students Given Probation (N = 645). 104

Table 145. Factor Intercorrelations for Students Given Probation. 104

Table 146. Correlations of All Variables for Students Given Probation (N = 645). 105

Table 147. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students Given Probation (N = 645) 106

Table 148. Extracted Variance for Students Given Suspension . . 107

Table 149. Promax Loadings of the Rotated Factors for Students Given Suspension (N = 293) 107

Table 150. Factor Intercorrelations for Students Given Suspension 107

Table 151. Correlations of All Variables for Students Given Suspension (N = 293) 108

Table 152. Significant Correlations of All Variables for Students Given Suspension (N = 293). 109

Table 153. A Comparison of Students Given Suspension and Students Given Probation 110

Explanation of Variables

1. Age - Actual age of the student.
2. Sex - 1-Male, 2-Female
3. Year in School - 1-Freshman
   2-Sophomore
   3-Junior
   4-Senior
4. Accumulative GPA - Actual grade point average.
5. Semester GPA - Actual grade point average.
6. Academic Load - Actual number of hours enrolled during semester violation occurred.
7. CEEB Verbal - Actual score.
8. CEEB Math - Actual Score.
9. CEEB Total - Actual score.
10. Number Involved - 1-One involved in violation.
    2-More than one involved in violation.
11. Socio-Economic Scale - 1-Professional
    2-Skilled
    3-Unskilled
    4-Unknown, retired or deceased
12. Action Taken - 1-Probation
    2-Suspension

Table 1

Breakdown By Year Of Disciplinary Action Taken

	Probation			Suspension		
Year	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1968-69	34	79	113	15	5*	20
1967-68	45	51	96	40	15	55
1966-67	71	35	106	21	29	50
1965-66	130	48	178	40	27	67
1964-65	57	43	100	43	13	56
1963-64	22	30	52	31	15	46
			645			294

*One suspended female student (1968-69) not used as a subject due to lack of pertinent information.

Table 2

Number And Percent Of Offenses Committed For

Total Sample By Academic Year

	Male		Female		Total	
Year	#	%	#	%	#	%
1968-69	49	8.9	83	21.3	132	14.1
1967-68	85	15.5	66	17.0	151	16.1
1966-67	92	16.8	64	16.5	156	16.6
1965-66	170	31.0	75	19.3	245	26.1
1964-65	100	18.2	56	14.4	156	16.6
1963-64	53	9.7	45	11.6	98	10.4

Table 2a

Enrollment* By Year And Number Of Offenses

	Male			Female			Total		
Year	Enrollment	#	%	Enrollment	#	%	Enrollment	#	%
1968-69	11,504	49	.43	7,530	83	1.10	19,034	132	.69
1967-68	11,336	85	.75	7,310	66	.90	18,646	151	.81
1966-67	10,970	92	.84	6,798	64	.94	17,768	156	.88
1965-66	10,138	170	1.69	6,167	75	1.22	16,305	245	1.50
1964-65	8,730	100	1.15	5,097	56	1.10	13,827	156	1.13
1963-64	7,731	53	.69	4,305	45	1.05	12,036	98	.81

*Official Fall enrollment

Table 3

Description Of Sample With University Overall Percentages As Comparison

Name	Male		Female		Total		Overall % 1967 - 68
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Sex	549	58.5	389	41.5	938	100	Male - 60.8 Female-39.2
College							
Agricultural Sciences	48	8.7	4	1.0	52	5.5	6.5
Arts & Sciences	170	31.0	191	49.1	361	38.5	32.7
Business Administration	204	37.2	54	13.9	258	27.5	22.5
Engineering	116	21.1	8	2.1	124	13.2	12.2
Home Economics	1	0.2	76	19.5	77	8.2	7.1
Education	4	0.7	56	14.4	60	6.4	7.6
Graduate School	6	1.1	0	0.0	6	0.6	11.2
Year In School							
Freshmen	307	55.9	226	58.1	533	56.8	34.9
Sophomore	121	22.0	93	23.9	214	22.8	21.3
Junior	76	13.8	48	12.3	124	13.2	18.2
Senior	39	7.1	22	5.6	61	6.5	14.1
Graduate	6	1.1	0	0.0	6	0.6	11.2
Method Of Entry							
From High School	446	81.2	323	83.0	769	82.0	73.4*
From Junior College	46	8.4	22	5.7	68	7.2	10.3*
From 4-Year College	57	10.4	44	11.3	101	10.8	15.6*
Home State							
Texas	503	91.6	368	94.6	871	92.9	93.7
Out Of State	46	8.4	21	5.4	67	7.1	5.7

*Percentages are on entering students the Fall of 1968.

Table 4

Description Of Sample

Name	Male #	Male %	Female #	Female %	Total #	Total %
Marital Status						
Single	543	98.9	385	99.0	928	98.9
Married	6	1.1	4	1.0	10	1.1
Residence						
Dormitory	357	65.0	349	89.7	706	75.3
In Town	143	26.0	31	8.0	174	18.6
With Parents	43	7.8	8	2.1	51	5.4
With Spouse	6	1.1	1	0.3	7	0.7
Number Involved						
One	268	48.8	319	82.0	587	62.6
More Than One	281	51.2	70	18.0	351	37.4
School Session						
Regular	537	97.8	365	93.8	902	96.2
Summer	12	2.2	24	6.2	36	3.8
Socio-Economic Scale						
Professional	194	35.3	154	39.6	348	37.1
Skilled	272	49.5	184	47.3	456	48.6
Unskilled	20	3.6	7	1.8	27	2.9
Unknown,Retired,Deceased	63	11.5	44	11.3	107	11.4
Action Taken						
Probation	359	65.4	286	73.5	645	68.8
Suspension	190	34.6	103	26.5	293	31.2

Table 4a

Disciplinary Offenders' Grade Point Average And Institutional Grade Point Average By College, Class and Sex*

College	Overall GPA	Offenders' GPA
Agricultural Sciences	2.13	1.48
Arts and Sciences	2.33	1.50
Business Administration	2.08	1.54
Engineering	2.14	1.51
Home Economics	2.52	1.65
Education	2.54	2.08

Class	Overall GPA	Offenders' GPA
Freshmen	1.99	1.35
Sophomore	2.26	1.70
Junior	2.40	1.84
Senior	2.72	2.32

Sex	Overall GPA	Offenders' GPA
Male	2.10	1.48
Female	2.52	1.70
Total	2.27	1.57

*Fall semester, 1968, grade point average is used for comparative purposes with the six year semester grade point average.

Table 5

Breakdown Of Offenses Committed

Offenses	Number Of Times Committed	Percent Of Total Sample
Alcohol	206	22.0
Dishonesty	7	0.7
Falsification	153	15.8
Property Destruction	11	1.2
Theft	224	23.9
Unlawful Assembly	2	0.2
Traffic	24	2.6
Breaking and Entering	4	0.4
Disturbance	22	2.3
Sexual	13	1.4
Fire Regulations	4	0.4
Gambling	12	1.3
Drugs	5	0.5
Hours	200	21.3
Men/Women in Halls	9	1.0
Keeping Girl Out All Night	10	1.1
Violating Residence Hall Rules	11	1.2
Violating Postal Laws	4	0.4
Forgery	7	0.7
Charged With Capital Crime (Murder)	2	0.2
Lewdness	1	0.1
Missuse of Draft Card	2	0.2
Check Fraud-Worthless Checks	3	0.3
Threatening Letter	1	0.1

Table 6

Breakdown Of Offenses By Month

Month	Number	Percent
January	76	8.1
February	137	14.6
March	128	13.6
April	80	8.5
May	185	19.7
June	16	1.7
July	26	2.8
August	11	1.2
September	14	1.5
October	118	12.6
November	79	8.4
December	68	7.2

Table 7

Extracted Variance For Total Sample Of Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Tests Data	69.08	69.08
II	Personal Data	20.23	89.31

Table 8

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For

Total Sample Of Students

(N-938)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.862
CEEB Math	.856
CEEB Verbal	.598

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.787
Age	.786

Table 9

Factor Intercorrelations For Total Sample Of Students

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	.281	-

Table 10

Correlations Of All Variables For Total Sample Of Students

(N - 938)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.110	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.729	-.050	-									
Accum GPA	.084	.145	.276	-								
Sem. GPA	.161	.117	.310	.610	-							
Acad. Load	-.106	-.124	-.037	.120	.149	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.050	.116	.017	.383	.296	.144	-					
CEEB Math	-.014	-.240	.040	.288	.226	.156	.552	-				
CEEB Total	-.056	-.089	.026	.370	.294	.154	.839	.848	-			
# Involved	-.063	-.338	-.062	-.060	-.075	.043	-.001	.116	.064	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.024	-.034	-.027	-.092	-.089	-.062	-.066	-.023	-.052	-.009	-	
Action Taken	.054	-.086	.002	-.109	-.125	-.042	-.019	.009	.002	-.046	.086	-

Table 11

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables

For Total Sample Of Students

(N - 938)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.729											
Accum. GPA			.276									
Sem. GPA			.310	.610								
Acad. Load												
CEEB Verbal				.383	.296							
CEEB Math		-.240		.288	.226		.552					
CEEB Total				.370	.294		.839	.848				
# Involved		-.338										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance:
.1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 12

Mean And Standard Deviation For

Total Sample Of Students

(N-938)

Variable	x	SD
Age	19.38	1.59
Sex	1.41	.49
Yr. In Sch.	1.71	.97
Accum GPA	1.72	.66
Sem. GPA	1.57	.93
Acad. Load	14.05	3.01
CEEB Verbal	433.96	83.51
CEEB Math	465.80	90.03
CEEB Total	896.54	158.98
# Involved	1.37	.48
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.89	.92
Action Taken	1.31	.46

Table 13

Extracted Variance For Male Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Tests and Accum GPA Data	73.02	73.02
II	Personal Data	22.36	95.38

Table 14

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors

For Male Students

(N-549)

Factor I--Entrance Tests and Accum GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.956
CEEB Math	.859
CEEB Verbal	.803
Accum GPA	.404

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.809
Age	.770

Table 15

Factor Intercorrelations For Male Students

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	.227	-

Table 16

Correlations Of All Variables For Male Students

(N - 549)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	.012	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.730	.010	-									
Accum GPA	.089	.012	.259	-								
Sem. GPA	.184	-.052	.313	.555	-							
Acad Load	-.148	.056	-.070	.093	.120	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.009	.042	.035	.310	.250	.122	-					
CEEB Math	-.077	.065	-.011	.347	.301	.144	.617	-				
CEEB Total	-.073	.058	.010	.359	.310	.126	.843	.876	-			
# Involved	-.143	.042	-.137	-.043	-.078	-.008	.043	.044	.039	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.077	.004	-.009	-.112	-.098	-.062	-.065	-.050	-.077	-.077	-	
Action Taken	.111	.059	.048	-.099	-.095	-.035	-.044	-.064	-.060	-.155	.086	-

Table 17

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Male Students

(N - 549)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.730											
Accum. GPA			.259									
Sem. GPA			.313	.555								
Acad. Load												
CEEB Verbal				.310	.250							
CEEB Math				.347	.301		.617					
CEEB Total				.359	.310		.843	.876				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

---

* Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 18

Extracted Variance For Female Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct
I	Entrance Tests and Accum GPA Data	74.20	74.20
II	Personal and Semester GPA Data	20.69	94.89

Table 19

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Female Students

(N-378)

Factor I--Entrance Tests and Accum GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.947
CEEB Verbal	.870
CEEB Math	.753
Accum GPA	.404

Factor II--Personal and Semester GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.797
Age	.735
Semester GPA	.421

Table 20

Factor Intercorrelations For Female Students

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	.355	-

Table 21

Correlations Of All Variables For Female Students

(N - 389)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.033	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.733	-.019	-									
Accum GPA	.129	.033	.329	-								
Sem. GPA	.169	.027	.328	.657	-							
Acad. Load	-.086	-.052	-.010	.188	.217	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.090	.081	.007	.440	.330	.203	-					
CEEB Math	.038	.090	.105	.332	.209	.119	.590	-				
CEEB Total	-.055	.091	.043	.429	.305	.171	.889	.828				
# Involved	-.015	.024	.023	.038	.029	.016	.040	.027	.030	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.089	-.008	-.060	-.060	-.070	-.073	-.058	-.001	-.023	.077	-	
Action Taken	-.093	.030	-.087	-.097	-.146	-.078	.038	.081	.084	.068	.080	-

Table 22

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Female Students

(N - 389)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.733											
Accum GPA			.329									
Sem. GPA			.328	.657								
Acad. Load					.217							
CEEB Verbal				.440	.330	.203						
CEEB Math				.332	.209		.590					
CEEB Total				.429	.305		.889	.828				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 23

A Comparison Of Male And Female Students

	Male (N-549)		Female (N-389)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level of Significance
Age	19.52	1.76	19.16	1.28	3.56	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.75	1.01	1.66	.90	1.57	NS
Accum GPA	1.64	.60	1.83	.71	4.36	.01
Sem. GPA	1.48	.90	1.70	.96	3.56	.01
Acad. Load	14.35	2.76	13.60	3.28	3.70	.01
CEEB Verbal	424.77	79.42	444.51	87.78	3.53	.01
CEEB Math	483.99	93.14	440.13	78.70	7.79	.01
CEEB Total	908.43	162.18	879.75	153.01	2.76	.01
# Involved	1.51	.50	1.17	.38	11.48	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.91	.92	1.85	.92	1.05	NS
Action Taken	1.35	.48	1.26	.44	2.69	.01

Table 24

Extracted Variance For Students With Total CEEB Scores Below Mean

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Personal Data	51.62	51.62
II	Low Entrance Test Scorers	27.80	79.41
III	High Entrance Test Scorers	14.33	93.74

Table 25

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students With Total CEEB Scores Below Mean

Factor I--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.778
Age	.778

Factor II--Low Entrance Test Scorers

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	-.870
CEEB Math	-.633
CEEB Verbal	-.549

Factor III--High Entrance Test Scorers

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.870
CEEB Math	.633
CEEB Verbal	.549

Table 26

Factor Intercorrelations For Students With Total CEEB Scores Below Mean

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	-.547	-	
III	-.547	1.000	-

Table 27

Correlations Of All Variables For Students With

Total CEEB Scores Below Mean

(N - 443)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.140	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.733	-.058	-									
Accum GPA	.084	.126	.316	-								
Sem. GPA	.230	.165	.399	.578	-							
Acad Load	.034	-.142	.074	.105	.135	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.009	.202	.089	.226	.136	-.017	-					
CEEB Math	.062	-.256	.125	.154	.059	.062	.142	-				
CEEB Total	-.111	-.040	.042	.228	.122	.012	.632	.602	-			
# Involved	-.031	-.345	-.082	-.065	-.112	.037	-.021	.172	.082	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.028	-.035	-.057	-.077	-.086	-.073	-.123	.024	-.068	-.025	-	
Action Taken	-.005	-.144	-.047	-.143	-.180	-.087	-.064	.076	.007	-.048	.059	-

Table 28

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students With Total CEEB Scores Below Mean

(N - 443)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.	.733											
Accum GPA			.316									
Sem. GPA	.230		.399	.578								
Acad Load												
CEEB Verbal		.202		.226								
CEEB Math		-.256										
CEEB Total				.228			.632	.602				
# Involved		-.345										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 29

Extracted Variance For Students With Total CEEB Scores Above Mean

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Personal Data	64.43	64.43
II	Entrance Test and Accum GPA Data	19.95	84.37
III	Entrance Test and Personal Data	10.48	94.86

Table 30

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students With Total CEEB Scores Above Mean

(N-495)

Factor I--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	-.759
Age	-.717

Factor II--Entrance Test and Accum GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.916
CEEB Verbal	.760
CEEB Math	.665
Accum GPA	.412

Factor III--Entrance Test and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	.838
CEEB Total	.717
Sex	-.445

Table 31

Factor Intercorrelations For Students With Total CEEB Scores Above Mean

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	-.265	-	
III	.417	-.629	

Table 32

Correlations Of All Variables For Students With

Total CEEB Scores Above Mean

(N - 495)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.081	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.719	-.030	-									
Accum GPA	.026	.212	.191	-								
Sem. GPA	.075	.117	.202	.568	-							
Acad Load	-.229	-.095	-.154	.065	.106	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.261	.203	-.236	.249	.181	.149	-					
CEEB Math	-.226	-.284	-.206	.073	.064	.115	.259	-				
CEEB Total	-.295	-.091	-.253	.183	.147	.133	.749	.774	-			
# Involved	-.090	-.329	-.055	-.074	-.062	.044	-.017	.114	.068	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.023	-035	-.003	-.109	-.095	-.052	-.045	-.056	-.074	.005	-	
Action Taken	.091	-.033	.032	-.105	-.100	-.010	-.026	-.061	-.038	-.045	.110	-

Table 33

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students With Total CEEB Scores Above Mean

(N - 495)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.	.719											
Accum. GPA		.212										
Sem. GPA			.202	.568								
Acad Load	-.229											
CEEB Verbal	-.261	.203	-.236	.249								
CEEB Math	-.226	-.284	-.206				.259					
CEEB Total	-.295		-.253				.749	.774				
# Involved		-.329										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 34

A Comparison Of Students With Total CEEB Scores Below The Mean And Students With Total CEEB Scores Above The Mean

(Mean-897)

	Total CEEB Below Mean (N-443)		Total CEEB Above Mean (N-495)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.17	1.34	19.56	1.77	3.79	.01
Sex	1.44	.50	1.39	.49	1.76	NS
Yr. In Sch.	1.55	.86	1.86	1.04	4.90	.01
Accum GPA	1.49	.59	1.92	.65	10.57	.01
Sem. GPA	1.30	.85	1.81	.94	8.76	.01
Acad. Load	13.63	2.93	14.42	3.03	4.07	.01
CEEB Verbal	375.89	57.83	484.03	68.57	2.62	.01
CEEB Math	402.60	57.67	522.36	74.91	2.76	.01
CEEB Total	768.44	89.01	1011.18	113.89	3.66	.01
# Involved	1.36	.48	1.38	.49	.64	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.89	.93	1.88	.91	.25	NS
Action Taken	1.30	.46	1.32	.47	.62	NS

Table 35

Extracted Variance For Freshmen Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	85.13	85.13
II	GPA and Personal Data	9.12	94.26

Table 36

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Freshmen Students

(N-533)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	.905
CEEB Total	.895
CEEB Verbal	.623

Factor II--GPA and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Sex	-.565
Sem. GPA	-.446
Accum GPA	-.440

Table 37

Factor Intercorrelations For Freshmen Students

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	-.364	-

Table 38

Correlations Of All Variables For Freshmen Students

(N - 533)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.089	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.066	-.037	-									
Accum GPA	-.155	.112	-.020	-								
Sem. GPA	-.095	.123	-.035	.582	-							
Acad Load	-.062	-.149	-.015	.152	.234	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.091	.139	-.017	.388	.372	.179	-					
CEEB Math	-.064	-.242	-.013	.280	.277	.205	.548	-				
CEEB Total	-.104	-.072	-.016	.369	.362	.212	.857	.866	-			
# Involved	-.055	-.380	.054	-.029	-.033	.073	-.049	.075	.022	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.014	-.031	.004	-.055	-.068	-.060	-.062	-.033	-.042	-.005	-	
Action Taken	.037	-.020	-.030	-.138	-.179	-.092	-.030	.002	-.009	-.118	.086	-

Table 39

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Freshmen Students

(N - 533)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.												
Accum GPA												
Sem. GPA				.582								
Acad. Load					.234							
CEEB Verbal				.388	.372							
CEEB Math		-.242		.280	.277	.205	.548					
CEEB Total				.369	.362	.212	.857	.866				
# Involved		-.380										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 40

Extracted Variance For Sophomore Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	79.22	79.22
II	GPA, Entrance Test and Personal Data	15.08	94.30

Table 41

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Sophomore Students

(N-214)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.910
CEEB Math	.872
CEEB Verbal	.672

Factor II--GPA, Entrance Test and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Accum GPA	-.646
Sem. GPA	-.562
Sex	-.453
CEEB Verbal	-.417

Table 42

Factor Intercorrelations For Sophomore Students

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	-.123	-

Table 43

Correlations Of All Variables For Sophomore Students

(N - 214)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.112	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.045	.060	-									
Accum. GPA	-.197	.164	-.019	-								
Sem. GPA	-.164	.093	-.130	.579	-							
Acad. Load	-.244	-.087	.007	.276	.194	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.149	.025	-.036	.440	.311	.188	-					
CEEB Math	-.078	-.33	-.137	.298	.204	.115	.573	-				
CEEB Total	-.103	-.214	-.097	.398	.293	.140	.843	.856	-			
# Involved	.063	-.388	.052	-.077	-.141	-.007	.102	.243	.200	-		
Soc- Ec. Scale	.090	.008	-.170	-.164	-.076	-.223	-.115	-.014	-.083	.004	-	
Action Taken	.047	-.198	-.108	-.077	-.059	.064	-.029	.008	-.019	.166	.127	-

Table 44

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Sophomore Students

(N - 214)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.												
Accum GPA	-.197											
Sem. GPA				.579								
Acad Load	-.244			.276	.194							
CEEB Verbal				.440	.311							
CEEB Math		-.333		.298	.204		.573					
CEEB Total		-.214		.398	.293		.843	.856				
# Involved		-.388						.243	.200			
Soc-Ec. Scale						-.223						
Action Taken		-.198										

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 45

Extracted Variance For Junior Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	79.52	79.52
II	GPA and Personal Data	12.70	92.22

Table 46

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Junior Students

(N-124)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.882
CEEB Math	.760
CEEB Verbal	.753

Factor II--GPA and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Accum GPA	.597
Sem. GPA	.569
Sex	.464

Table 47

Factor Intercorrelations For Junior Students

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	.224	-

Table 48

Correlations Of All Variables For Junior Students

(N - 124)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.058	-										
Yr. In Sch.	-.072	-.017	-									
Accum GPA	-.128	.305	-.044	-								
Sem. GPA	-.070	.200	-.129	.459	-							
Acad. Load	-.110	-.166	-.029	-.040	.020	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.106	.142	-.059	.325	-.038	.040	-					
CEEB Math	-.134	-.045	-.043	.305	.051	.034	.559	-				
CEEB Total	-.209	.057	-.110	.344	.041	.065	.764	.758	-			
# Involved	-.032	-.163	.117	-.002	.050	.076	.001	.093	.017	-		
Soc- Ec. Scale	.116	-.082	-.094	-.119	-.132	.090	.040	-.040	-.031	-.107	-	
Action Taken	.098	-.132	.135	-.029	-.055	-.082	.074	.117	.112	-.039	-.029	-

Table 49

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Junior Students

(N - 124)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.												
Accum GPA		.305										
Sem. GPA		.200		.459								
Acad. Load												
CEEB Verbal				.325								
CEEB Math				.305			.559					
CEEB Total	-.209			.344			.764	.758				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 50

Extracted Variance For Senior Students

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	62.26	62.26
II	GPA and Personal Data	26.02	88.28
III	Academic Load and Personal Data	6.42	94.70

Table 51

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Senior Students

(N-61)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.902
CEEB Math	.828
CEEB Verbal	.677

Factor II--GPA and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Accumulative GPA	.798
Semester GPA	.653
Sex	.508
Age	-.433

Factor III--Academic Load and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Academic Load	.641
Socio-Economic Scale	.434

Table 52

Factor Intercorrelations For Senior Students

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.076	-	
III	-.006	-.400	-

Table 53

Correlations Of All Variables For Senior Students

(N -61)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.142	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.068	-.169	-									
Accum GPA	-.440	.422	-.066	-								
Sem. GPA	-.253	.387	-.105	.640	-							
Acad Load	-.016	-.104	.376	-.105	.640	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.047	.190	-.005	.389	.110	-.086	-					
CEEB Math	.008	-.224	-.010	.316	-.019	.078	.458	-				
CEEB Total	-.161	-.082	-.005	.417	.091	.107	.736	.767	-			
# Involved	-.112	-.188	.073	-.075	-.077	-.076	.144	.153	.093	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.070	-.079	.116	-.052	.179	.337	-.110	.141	-.066	-.086	-	
Action Taken	.148	-.134	.085	-.199	-.131	.163	-.023	-.034	.027	-.135	.101	-

Table 54

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Senior Students

(N - 61)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.												
Accum GPA	-.440	.422										
Sem. GPA	-.253	.387		.640								
Acad Load			.376									
CEEB Verbal				.389								
CEEB Math				.316			.458					
CEEB Total				.417			.736	.767				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale						.337						
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .2500 to .3247, .05
.3248 to .4077, .01
.4078 or above, .001

Table 55

A Comparison Of Sophomore Students and Freshmen Students

Variable	Sophomore Students (N-214) x	SD	Freshmen Students (N-533) x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.60	.93	18.59	.93	13.53	.01
Sex	1.43	.50	1.42	.49	.26	NS
Accum GPA	1.83	.60	1.57	.67	5.19	.01
Sem. GPA	1.70	.91	1.35	.91	4.77	.01
Acad. Load	14.29	2.75	14.03	2.91	1.19	NS
CEEB Verbal	439.59	80.84	430.25	89.59	1.38	NS
CEEB Math	479.39	89.13	459.76	96.34	2.65	.05
CEEB Total	917.86	156.52	888.50	166.84	2.27	NS
# Involved	1.36	.48	1.39	.49	.75	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.84	.87	1.92	.96	1.03	NS
Action Taken	1.29	.45	1.32	.47	.97	NS

Table 56

A Comparison Of Junior Students And Freshmen Students

	Junior Students (N-124)		Freshmen Students (N-533)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	20.73	.91	18.59	.93	23.54	.01
Sex	1.39	.49	1.42	.49	.26	NS
Accum GPA	1.89	.53	1.57	.67	5.69	.01
Sem. GPA	1.84	.75	1.35	.91	6.31	.01
Acad. Load	14.06	3.30	14.03	2.91	.12	NS
CEEB Verbal	434.61	67.48	430.25	89.59	.61	NS
CEEB Math	470.31	65.66	459.76	96.34	1.46	NS
CEEB Total	895.89	136.55	888.50	166.84	.52	NS
# Involved	1.37	.49	1.39	.49	.48	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.88	.84	.87	1.92	.42	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.46	1.32	.47	.31	NS

Table 57

A Comparison Of Senior Students And Freshmen Students

	Senior Students (N-61)		Freshmen Students (N-533)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	21.85	1.61	18.59	.93	15.54	.01
Sex	1.36	.48	1.42	.49	.97	NS
Accum GPA	2.18	.61	1.57	.67	7.30	.01
Sem. GPA	2.32	.83	1.35	.91	8.56	.01
Acad. Load	13.69	3.64	14.03	2.91	.70	NS
CEEB Verbal	430.03	70.54	430.25	89.59	.02	NS
CEEB Math	461.57	78.82	459.76	96.34	.17	NS
CEEB Total	893.00	143.34	88.50	166.84	.23	NS
# Involved	1.25	.43	1.39	.49	2.49	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.72	.80	1.92	.96	1.76	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.47	1.32	.47	.15	NS

Table 58

A Comparison Of Senior Students And Sophomore Students

	Senior Students (N-61)		Sophomore Students (N-214)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	21.85	1.61	19.60	.93	10.43	.01
Sex	1.36	.48	1.43	.50	1.05	NS
Accum GPA	2.18	.61	1.83	.60	3.96	.01
Sem. GPA	2.32	.83	1.70	.91	5.04	.01
Acad Load	13.69	3.64	14.29	2.75	1.21	NS
CEEB Verbal	430.03	70.54	439.59	80.84	.90	NS
CEEB Math	461.57	78.82	479.39	89.13	1.51	NS
CEEB Total	893.00	143.34	917.86	156.52	1.17	NS
# Involved	1.25	.43	1.36	.48	1.83	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.72	.80	1.84	.87	1.01	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.47	1.29	.45	.39	NS

Table 59

A Comparison Of Junior Students And Sophomore Students

	Junior Students (N-124)		Sophomore Students (N-214)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	20.73	.91	19.60	.93	10.92	.01
Sex	1.39	.49	1.43	.50	.86	NS
Accum GPA	1.89	.53	1.83	.60	.90	NS
Sem. GPA	1.84	.75	1.70	.91	1.54	NS
Acad. Load	14.06	3.30	14.29	2.75	.66	NS
CEEB Verbal	434.61	67.48	439.59	80.84	.61	NS
CEEB Math	470.31	65.66	479.39	89.13	1.07	NS
CEEB Total	895.89	136.55	917.86	156.52	1.35	NS
# Involved	1.37	.49	1.36	.48	.12	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.88	.84	1.84	.87	.39	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.46	1.29	.45	.41	NS

Table 60

A Comparison Of Senior Students And Junior Students

	Senior Students (N-61)		Junior Students (N-124)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	21.85	1.61	20.73	.91	5.04	.01
Sex	1.36	.48	1.39	.49	.35	NS
Accum GPA	2.18	.61	1.89	.53	3.20	.01
Sem. GPA	2.32	.83	1.84	.75	3.81	.01
Acad. Load	13.69	3.64	14.06	3.30	.68	NS
CEEB Verbal'	430.03	70.54	434.61	67.48	.42	NS
CEEB Math	461.57	78.82	470.31	65.66	.75	NS
CEEB Total	893.00	143.34	895.89	136.55	.13	NS
#Involved	1.25	.43	1.37	.49	1.78	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.72	.80	1.88	.84	1.24	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.47	1.31	.46	.07	NS

Table 61

Extracted Variance For Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	60.79	60.79
II	GPA, Academic Load, and Action Data	28.80	89.59
III	Personal Data	6.55	96.14

Table 62

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

(N-52)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.909
CEEB Verbal	.860
CEEB Math	.778

Factor II--GPA, Academic Load and Action Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Accumulative GPA	.732
Semester GPA	.698
Academic Load	.456
Action Taken	-.400

Factor III--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.811
Year In School	.742

Table 63

Factor Intercorrelations For Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.208	-	
III	-.156	.281	-

Table 64

Correlations Of All Variables For Students

In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

(N - 52)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.066	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.759	-.103	-									
Accum GPA	.021	-.062	.220	-								
Sem. GPA	.160	.011	.356	.698	-							
Acad. Load	-.016	.088	.118	.326	.401	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.120	.315	-.026	.198	.298	.073	-					
CEEB Math	-.148	.198	-.060	.213	.229	.041	.659	-				
CEEB Total	-.231	.288	-.087	.221	.286	.046	.876	.855	-			
# Involved	-.173	-.187	-.113	-.010	-.054	-.065	.002	.113	.099	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.043	.000	-.090	-.156	-.105	.171	.168	.069	.027	.073	-	
Action Taken	-.083	.079	-.213	-.321	-.275	-.234	.011	-.129	-.032	-.076	.088	-

Table 65

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College of Agricultural Sciences

(N - 52)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.759											
Accum GPA												
Sem. GPA			.356	.698								
Acad. Load				.326	.401							
CEEB Verbal		.315			.298							
CEEB Math							.659					
CEEB Total		.288			.286		.876	.855				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken				-.321	-.275							

*Level of Significance: .2732 to .3540, .05
.3541 to .4432, .01
.4433 or above, .001

Table 66

Extracted Variance For Students In The College Of Arts & Sciences

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	73.33	73.33
II	Personal Data	15.91	89.25
III	GPA & Personal Data	7.46	96.70

Table 67

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students In The College Of Arts & Sciences

(N-361)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.871
CEEB Math	.838
CEEB Verbal	.638

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.796
Year In School	.781

Factor III--GPA And Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Accumulative GPA	.592
Semester GPA	.573
Sex	.480

Table 68

Factor Intercorrelations For Students In The College Of Arts & Sciences

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.035	-	
III	.396	.059	-

Table 69

Correlations Of All Variables For Students

In The College Of Arts And Sciences

(N - 361)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.092	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.709	-.034	-									
Accum GPA	.033	.177	.242	-								
Sem. GPA	.052	.150	.207	.598	-							
Acad. Load	-.037	-.112	.067	.103	.189	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.040	.097	.075	.425	.309	.206	-					
CEEB Math	.019	-.192	.085	.313	.205	.149	.586	-				
CEEB Total	-.046	-.085	.086	.407	.283	.181	.861	.859	-			
# Involved	-.100	-.309	-.093	-.031	-.005	.055	.035	.086	.080	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.076	-.013	.004	-.093	-.103	-.050	-.067	-.068	-.072	-.021	-	
Action Taken	.058	-.105	.039	-.116	-.156	.019	-.045	-.032	-.033	-.061	.093	-

Table 70

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Arts And Sciences

(N - 361)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.709											
Accum GPA			.242									
Sem. GPA			.207	.598								
Acad. Load												
CEEB Verbal				.425	.309	.206						
CEEB Math				.313	.205		.586					
CEEB Total				.407	.283		.861	.859				
# Involved		-.309										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance:
.1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 71

Extracted Variance For Students In The

College Of Business Administration

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	76.07	76.07
II	Personal Data	14.71	90.77

Table 72

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students

In The College Of Business Administration

(N-258)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.852
CEEB Math	.814
CEEB Verbal	.624

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.751
Age	.696

Table 73

Factor Intercorrelations For Students In The

College Of Business Administration

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	.451	-

Table 74

Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Business Administration

(N - 258)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.167	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.646	-.102	-									
Accum GPA	.103	.070	.288	-								
Sem. GPA	.188	.064	.337	.580	-							
Acad. Load	-.034	-.230	-.027	.144	.111	-						
CEEB Verbal	.043	.166	.055	.394	.344	.089	-					
CEEB Math	.044	-.193	.086	.365	.357	.177	.576	-				
CEEB Total	.008	-.033	.053	.404	.392	.135	.821	.836	-			
# Involved	.010	-.257	.044	-.044	-.136	.050	.036	.075	.046	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.034	-.090	-.082	-.042	-.094	-.003	-.070	.009	-.027	.123	-	
Action Taken	.064	-.004	.003	-.031	-.075	-.069	.027	.025	.042	-.100	.022	-

Table 75

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Business Administration

(N - 258)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.646											
Accum GPA			.288									
Sem. GPA			.337	.580								
Acad Load		-.230										
CEEB Verbal				.394	.344							
CEEB Math				.365	.357		.576					
CEEB Total				.404	.392		.821	.836				
# Involved		-.257										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

* Levels of Significance:
.1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 76

Extracted Variance For Students In The College Of Engineering

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	64.05	64.05
II	Personal Data	27.71	91.77
III	Entrance Test and Personal Data	3.65	95.42

Table 77

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students In The College Of Engineering

(N-124)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	.755
CEEB Total	.524

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.879
Age	.820

Factor III--Entrance Test and Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Verbal	-.672
Sex	-.409

Table 78

Factor Intercorrelations For Students In The College Of Engineering

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.055	-	
III	-.565	-.209	-

Table 79

Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Engineering

(N - 124)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.146	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.795	-.114	-									
Accum. GPA	.131	.045	.314	-								
Sem. GPA	.090	.031	.274	.537	-							
Acad. Load	-.276	.107	-.179	.109	.155	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.185	.198	.154	.256	.291	.088	-					
CEEB Math	-.135	-.086	-.062	.263	.349	.281	.468	-				
CEEB Total	-.132	.032	-.069	.275	.384	.190	.786	.855	-			
# Involved	-.190	-.195	-.199	-.013	-.082	.017	-.003	.090	.023	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.046	-.088	.040	-.145	.056	-.075	-.093	.061	-.008	.039	-	
Action Taken	.089	.034	.047	-.106	-.016	-.009	-.115	-.049	-.084	-.052	.187	-

Table 80

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Engineering

(N - 124)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.795											
Accum GPA			.314									
Sem. GPA			.274	.537								
Acad Load	-.276											
CEEB Verbal		.198		.256	.291							
CEEB Math				.263	.349	.281	.468					
CEEB Total				.275	.384		.786	.855				
# Involved		-.195	-.199									
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 81

Extracted Variance For Students In The College Of Home Economics

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	59.46	59.46
II	Personal Data	27.88	87.34
III	GPA and Academic Load	5.88	93.22

Table 82

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students In The College Of Home Economics

(N-77)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.947
CEEB Math	.734
CEEB Verbal	.718

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.797
Year In School	.760

Factor III--GPA and Academic Load

Variable	Promax Loading
Semester GPA	.614
Accumulative GPA	.603
Academic Load	.467

Table 83

Factor Intercorrelations For Students In The College Of Home Economics

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.032	-	
III	.138	.285	-

Table 84

Correlations Of All Variables For Students

In The College Of Home Economics

(N - 77)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	.023	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.777	-.018	-									
Accum GPA	.233	.039	.411	-								
Sem. GPA	.207	.015	.392	.635	-							
Acad Load	-.078	-.075	-.007	.219	257	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.047	-.022	.070	.428	.211	.055	-					
CEEB Math	-.009	-.056	.047	.241	.042	.056	.464	-				
CEEB Total	-.029	.183	.054	.408	.177	.047	.851	.764	-			
# Involved	-.102	.058	-.143	-.104	.005	-.082	.005	.063	.016	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.162	-.003	-.066	-.133	-.076	-.144	-.151	.039	-.073	.196	-	
Action Taken	.113	-.198	-.181	-.129	-.155	-.277	.062	.266	.153	.004	.043	-

Table 85

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Home Economics

(N - 77)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.	.777											
Accum GPA	.233		.411									
Sem. GPA			.392	.635								
Acad. Load					.257							
CEEB Verbal				.428								
CEEB Math				.241			.464					
CEEB Total				.408				.764				
# Involved												
Soc- Ec. Scale												
Action Taken						.277		.266				

*Levels of Significance: .2319 to .3016, .05
.3017 to .3798, .01
.3799 or above, .001

Table 86

Extracted Variance For Students In The

College of Education

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	69.10	69.10
II	Personal Data	20.19	89.29
III	GPA Data	5.48	94.76

Table 87

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students In The

College of Education

(N-60)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.849
CEEB Math	.839
CEEB Verbal	.641

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.760
Age	.747

Factor III--GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Semester GPA	.727
Accumulative GPA	.708

Table 88

Factor Intercorrelations For Students In The

College of Education

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.140	-	
III	.430	.134	-

Table 89

Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Education

(N - 60)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.057	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.685	-.167	-									
Accum GPA	-.104	-.081	.186	-								
Sem. GPA	.201	-.135	.444	.711	-							
Acad Load	-.101	-.252	-.072	.080	.122	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.164	-.171	-.066	.375	.301	.209	-					
CEEB Math	-.025	-.333	.144	.324	.237	.041	.567	-				
CEEB Total	-.111	-.282	.040	.395	.303	.142	.877	.868	-			
# Involved	.084	-.090	.146	.092	.085	.289	-.119	.056	-.039	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.043	-.052	-.107	-.033	-.202	.048	.002	-.057	-.031	.076	-	
Action Taken	-.081	-.033	-.068	-.117	-.177	.154	.080	.124	.114	.048	.097	-

Table 90

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students In The College Of Education

(N - 60)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.685											
Accum GPA												
Sem. GPA			.444	.711								
Acad. Load		-.252										
CEEB Verbal				.375	.301							
CEEB Math		-.333		.324			.567					
CEEB Total		-.282		.395	.303		.877	.868				
# Involved						.289						
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .2500 to .3247, .05
.3248 to .4077, .01
.4078 or above, .001

Table 91

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Arts And Sciences And Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

	Arts and Sciences (N-361)		Agricultural Sciences (N-52)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.19	1.35	19.58	1.41	1.89	NS
Sex	1.53	.50	1.08	.27	9.90	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.62	.90	1.87	1.01	1.65	NS
Accum GPA	1.71	.72	1.55	.65	1.59	NS
Sem. GPA	1.50	.97	1.48	.92	.10	NS
Acad. Load	14.27	2.87	15.12	2.07	2.62	NS
CEEB Verbal	446.04	87.63	412.10	95.41	2.42	NS
CEEB Math	460.50	92.92	450.37	84.10	.80	NS
CEEB Total	905.93	166.51	856.17	168.41	1.99	NS
# Involved	1.31	.46	1.58	.50	3.67	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.92	.95	1.75	.80	1.43	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.46	1.37	.49	.73	NS

Table 92

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Education And Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

Variable	Education (N-60) x	SD	Agricultural Sciences (N-52) x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.67	1.54	19.58	1.41	.32	NS
Sex	1.93	.25	1.08	.27	17.31	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.88	.98	1.87	1.01	.10	NS
Accum GPA	1.98	.78	1.55	.65	3.14	.05
Sem. GPA	2.08	1.00	1.48	.92	3.30	.05
Acad. Load	13.90	3.00	15.12	2.07	2.53	NS
CEEB Verbal	443.10	74.07	412.10	95.41	1.90	NS
CEEB Math	440.27	71.81	450.37	84.10	.68	NS
CEEB Total	882.97	129.47	856.17	168.41	.93	NS
# Involved	1.13	.34	1.58	.50	5.40	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.60	.76	1.75	.80	1.02	NS
Action Taken	1.20	.40	1.37	.49	1.94	NS

Table 93

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Home Economics And Students In The College Of Engineering

	Home Economics (N-77)		Engineering (N-124)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.30	1.50	19.26	1.35	.19	NS
Sex	1.99	.11	1.06	.25	35.93	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.84	1.00	1.65	.93	1.35	NS
Accum GPA	1.85	.65	1.78	.57	.81	NS
Sem. GPA	1.65	.82	1.51	.92	1.13	NS
Acad. Load	13.49	3.82	14.32	2.91	1.63	NS
CEEB Verbal	417.99	78.86	448.31	70.80	2.75	NS
CEEB Math	433.02	70.88	526.37	92.94	8.04	.01
CEEB Total	843.51	129.38	980.44	142.26	7.02	.01
# Involved	1.21	.41	1.50	.50	4.51	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.97	1.04	1.77	.81	1.44	NS
Action Taken	1.25	.43	1.31	.47	1.05	NS

Table 94

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Home Economics And Students In The College Of Business Administration

Variable	Home Economics (N-77) x	SD	Business Administration (N-258) x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.30	1.50	19.41	1.44	.58	NS
Sex	1.99	.11	1.21	.41	27.28	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.84	1.00	1.69	.94	1.23	NS
Accum GPA	1.85	.65	1.62	.55	2.78	NS
Sem. GPA	1.65	.82	1.54	.85	1.02	NS
Acad. Load	13.49	3.82	13.68	2.96	.39	NS
CEEB Verbal	417.99	78.86	413.60	80.35	.43	NS
CEEB Math	433.02	70.88	462.89	83.13	3.11	.05
CEEB Total	843.51	129.38	870.13	154.20	1.51	NS
# Involved	1.21	.41	1.47	.50	4.73	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.97	1.04	1.94	.91	.27	NS
Action Taken	1.25	.43	1.34	.47	1.57	NS

Table 95

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Arts And Sciences And Students In The College Of Home Economics

	Arts And Sciences (N-361)		Home Economics (N-77)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.19	1.35	19.30	1.50	.61	NS
Sex	1.53	.50	1.99	.11	15.61	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.62	.90	1.84	1.00	1.81	NS
Accum GPA	1.71	.72	1.85	.65	1.70	NS
Sem. GPA	1.50	.97	1.65	.82	1.44	NS
Acad. Load	14.27	2.87	13.49	3.82	1.67	NS
CEEB Verbal	446.04	87.63	417.99	78.86	2.78	NS
CEEB Math	460.50	92.92	433.02	70.88	2.91	NS
CEEB Total	905.93	166.51	843.51	129.38	3.64	.01
# Involved	1.31	.46	1.21	.41	1.90	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.92	.95	1.97	1.04	.40	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.46	1.25	.43	1.20	NS

Table 96

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Home Economics And Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

	Home Economics (N-77)		Agricultural Sciences (N-52)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.30	1.50	19.58	1.41	1.07	NS
Sex	1.99	.11	1.08	.27	23.04	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.84	1.00	1.87	1.01	.12	NS
Accum GPA	1.85	.65	1.55	.65	2.55	NS
Sem. GPA	1.65	.82	1.48	.92	1.06	NS
Acad. Load	13.49	3.82	15.12	2.07	3.11	.05
CEEB Verbal	417.99	78.86	412.10	95.41	.37	NS
CEEB Math	433.02	70.88	450.37	84.10	1.22	NS
CEEB Total	843.51	129.38	856.17	168.41	.46	NS
# Involved	1.21	.41	1.58	.50	4.43	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.97	1.04	1.75	.80	1.39	NS
Action Taken	1.25	.43	1.37	.49	1.42	NS

Table 97

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Business Administration And Students In The College Of Engineering

	Business Administration (N-258)		Engineering (N-124)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.41	1.44	19.26	1.35	1.01	NS
Sex	1.21	.41	1.06	.25	4.30	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.69	.94	1.65	.93	.32	NS
Accum GPA	1.62	.55	1.78	.57	2.48	NS
Sem. GPA	1.54	.85	1.51	.92	.32	NS
Acad. Load	13.68	2.96	14.32	2.91	2.01	NS
CEEB Verbal	413.60	80.35	448.31	70.80	4.29	.01
CEEB Math	462.89	83.13	526.37	92.94	6.46	.01
CEEB Total	870.13	154.20	980.44	142.26	6.90	.01
# Involved	1.47	.50	1.50	.50	.50	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.94	.91	1.77	.81	1.77	NS
Action Taken	1.34	.47	1.31	.47	.44	NS

Table 98

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Business Administration And Students In The College Of Arts And Sciences

Variable	Business Administration (N-258) x	SD	Arts And Sciences (N-361) x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.41	1.44	19.19	1.35	1.97	NS
Sex	1.21	.41	1.53	.50	8.75	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.69	.94	1.62	.90	.87	NS
Accum GPA	1.62	.55	1.71	.72	1.67	NS
Sem. GPA	1.54	.85	1.50	.97	.59	NS
Acad. Load	13.68	2.96	14.27	2.87	2.41	NS
CEEB Verbal	413.60	80.35	446.04	87.63	4.77	.01
CEEB Math	462.89	83.13	460.50	92.92	.33	NS
CEEB Total	870.13	154.20	905.93	166.51	2.75	NS
# Involved	1.47	.50	1.31	.46	4.19	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.94	.91	1.92	.95	.21	NS
Action Taken	1.34	.47	1.31	.46	.63	NS

Table 99

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Arts And Sciences And Students In The College Of Engineering

	Arts And Sciences (N-361)		Engineering (N-124)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.19	1.35	19.26	1.35	.51	NS
Sex	1.53	.50	1.06	.25	13.51	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.62	.90	1.65	.93	.34	NS
Accum GPA	1.71	.72	1.78	.57	1.06	NS
Sem. GPA	1.50	.97	1.51	.92	.12	NS
Acad. Load	14.27	2.87	14.32	2.91	.19	NS
CEEB Verbal	446.04	87.63	448.31	70.80	.29	NS
CEEB Math	460.50	92.92	526.37	92.94	6.81	.01
CEEB Total	905.93	166.51	980.44	142.26	4.81	.01
# Involved	1.31	.46	1.50	.50	3.76	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.92	.95	1.77	.81	1.67	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.46	1.31	.47	.03	NS

Table 100

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Business Administration And Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

	Business Administration (N-258)		Agricultural Sciences (N-52)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.41	1.44	19.58	1.41	.77	NS
Sex	1.21	.41	1.08	.27	2.93	NS
Yr. In Sch.	1.69	.94	1.87	1.01	1.18	NS
Accum. GPA	1.62	.55	1.55	.65	.73	NS
Sem. GPA	1.54	.85	1.48	.92	.41	NS
Acad. Load	13.68	2.96	15.12	2.07	4.22	.01
CEEB Verbal	413.60	80.35	412.10	95.41	.11	NS
CEEB Math	462.89	83.13	450.37	84.10	.98	NS
CEEB Total	870.13	154.20	865.17	168.41	.55	NS
# Involved	1.47	.50	1.58	.50	1.37	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.94	.91	1.75	.80	1.53	NS
Action Taken	1.34	.47	1.37	.49	.38	NS

Table 101

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Engineering And Students In The College Of Agricultural Sciences

	Engineering (N-124)		Agricultural Sciences (n-52)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.26	1.35	19.58	1.41	1.39	NS
Sex	1.06	.25	1.08	.27	.29	NS
Yr. In Sch.	1.65	.93	1.87	1.01	1.30	NS
Accum GPA	1.78	.57	1.55	.65	2.16	NS
Sem. GPA	1.51	.92	1.48	.92	.17	NS
Acad. Load	14.32	2.91	15.12	2.07	2.04	NS
CEEB Verbal	448.31	70.80	412.10	95.41	2.47	NS
CEEB Math	526.37	92.94	450.37	84.10	5.30	.01
CEEB Total	980.44	142.26	856.17	168.41	4.67	.01
# Involved	1.50	.50	1.58	.50	.93	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.77	.81	1.75	.80	.18	NS
Action Taken	1.31	.47	1.37	.49	.64	NS

Table 102

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Education And Students In The College Of Arts And Sciences

	Education (N-60)		Arts And Sciences (N-361)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.67	1.54	19.19	1.35	2.28	NS
Sex	1.93	.25	1.53	.50	9.67	.01
Yr. In School	1.88	.98	1.62	.90	1.95	NS
Accum GPA	1.98	.78	1.71	.72	2.50	NS
Sem. GPA	2.08	1.00	1.50	.97	4.21	.01
Acad. Load	13.90	3.00	14.27	2.87	.88	NS
CEEB Verbal	443.10	74.07	446.04	87.63	.28	NS
CEEB Math	440.27	71.81	460.50	92.92	1.93	NS
CEEB Total	882.97	129.47	905.93	166.51	1.22	NS
# Involved	1.13	.34	1.31	.46	3.45	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.60	.76	1.92	.95	2.92	NS
Action Taken	1.20	.40	1.31	.46	1.96	NS

Table 103

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Education And Students In The College Of Business Administration

Variable	Education (N-60) x	Education (N-60) SD	Business Administration (N-258) x	Business Administration (N-258) SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.67	1.54	19.41	1.44	1.18	NS
Sex	1.93	.25	1.21	.41	17.57	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.88	.98	1.69	.94	1.42	NS
Accum GPA	1.98	.78	1.62	.55	3.33	.05
Sem. GPA	2.08	1.00	1.54	.85	3.88	.01
Acad. Load	13.90	3.00	13.68	2.96	.52	NS
CEEB Verbal	443.10	74.07	413.60	80.35	2.73	NS
CEEB Math	440.27	71.81	462.89	83.13	2.13	NS
CEEB Total	882.97	129.47	870.13	154.20	.67	NS
# Involved	1.13	.34	1.47	.50	6.27	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.60	.76	1.94	.91	2.97	.05
Action Taken	1.20	.40	1.34	.47	2.29	NS

Table 104

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Education And Students In The College Of Engineering

	Education (N-60)		Engineering (N-124)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.67	1.54	19.26	1.35	1.76	NS
Sex	1.93	.25	1.06	.25	22.10	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.88	.98	1.65	.93	1.52	NS
Accum GPA	1.98	.78	1.78	.57	1.78	NS
Sem. GPA	2.08	1.00	1.51	.92	37.37	.01
Acad. Load	13.90	3.00	14.32	2.91	.90	NS
CEEB Verbal	443.10	74.07	448.31	70.80	.45	NS
CEEB Math	440.27	71.81	526.37	92.94	6.90	.01
CEEB Total	882.97	129.47	980.44	142.26	4.63	.01
# Involved	1.13	.34	1.50	.50	5.80	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.60	.76	1.77	.81	1.42	NS
Action Taken	1.20	.40	1.31	.47	1.71	NS

Table 105

A Comparison Of Students In The College Of Education And Students In The College Of Home Economics

	Education (N-60)		Home Economics (N-77)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.67	1.54	19.30	1.50	1.41	NS
Sex	1.93	.25	1.99	.11	1.53	NS
Yr. In Sch.	1.88	.98	1.84	1.00	.23	NS
Accum GPA	1.98	.78	1.85	.65	1.03	NS
Sem. GPA	2.08	1.00	1.65	.82	2.71	NS
Acad. Load	13.90	3.00	13.49	3.82	.70	NS
CEEB Verbal	443.10	74.07	417.99	78.86	1.91	NS
CEEB Math	440.27	71.81	433.02	70.88	.59	NS
CEEB Total	882.97	129.47	843.51	129.38	1.77	NS
# Involved	1.13	.34	1.21	.41	1.16	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.60	.76	1.97	1.04	2.43	NS
Action Taken	1.20	.40	1.25	.43	.65	NS

Table 106

Extracted Variance For Students With

Accumulated GPA Above The Mean

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	68.53	68.53
II	Personal Data	17.97	86.49
III	Entrance Test Data	10.02	96.51

Table 107

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For

Students With Accumulated GPA Above Mean

(N-378)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	.885
CEEB Total	.835
CEEB Verbal	.504
Sex	-.429

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.812
Year In School	.796

Factor III--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	-.885
CEEB Total	-.833
CEEB Verbal	-.502
Sex	.430

Table 108

Factor Intercorrelations For Students With

Accumulated GPA Above The Mean

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.076	-	
III	1.000	.077	-

Table 109

Correlations Of All Variables For Students With Accumulated GPA Above Mean

(N - 378)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.139	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.753	-.079	-									
Accum GPA	-.050	.177	-.029	-								
Sem. GPA	.060	.083	.129	.500	-							
Acad. Load	-.221	-.083	-.154	.089	.067	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.182	.155	-.183	.397	.133	.143	-					
CEEB Math	-.093	-.329	-.091	.249	.065	.112	.500	-				
CEEB Total	-.164	-.125	-.144	.371	.120	.129	.841	.840	-			
# Involved	-.066	-.273	-.072	-.067	-.113	.013	.011	.175	.102	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.090	.026	.065	-.065	-.048	-.049	-.064	-.047	-.063	-.080	-	
Action Taken	.124	-.101	.070	.008	.022	.049	.017	.046	.060	.040	.124	-

Table 110

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students With Accumulated GPA Above Mean

(N - 378)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.	.753											
Accum GPA												
Sem. GPA				.500								
Acad Load	-.221											
CEEB Verbal				.397								
CEEB Math		-.329		.249			.500					
CEEB Total				.371			.841	.840				
# Involved		-.273										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 111

Extracted Variance For Students With Accumulated GPA Below The Mean

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	69.74	69.74
II	Personal Data	19.28	89.02
III	Personal and Offense Data	5.09	94.11

Table 112

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students With Accumulated GPA Below Mean

(N-560)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.961
CEEB Math	.818
CEEB Verbal	.808

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.795
Age	.767

Factor III--Personal and Offense Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Sex	-.593
Number Involved	.423

Table 113

Factor Intercorrelations For Students With Accumulated GPA Below The Mean

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.127	-	
III	.016	.033	-

Table 114

Correlations Of All Variables For Students With Accumulated GPA Below Mean

(N - 560)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.128	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.706	-.117	-									
Accum GPA	-.069	.001	.114	-								
Sem. GPA	.118	.052	.228	.356	-							
Acad. Load	-.043	-.117	.016	.079	.164	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.040	.033	.011	.164	.226	.111	-					
CEEB Math	-.015	-.231	.032	.196	.209	.166	.548	-				
CEEB Total	-.061	-.129	.002	.192	.244	.142	.819	.848	-			
# Involved	-.039	-.370	-.007	.056	.008	.078	.032	.110	.081	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.021	-.044	-016	.065	-.015	-.053	-.008	.032	.008	.011	-	
Action Taken	.031	-.062	-.002	-.131	-.174	-.095	-.005	.013	.002	-.108	.052	-

Table 115

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students With Accumulated GPA Below Mean

(N - 560)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.706											
Accum. GPA												
Sem. GPA			.228	.356								
Acad. Load												
CEEB Verbal					.226							
CEEB Math		-.231		.196	.209		.548					
CEEB Total					.244		.819	.848				
# Involved		-.370										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 116

A Comparison Of Students With Accumulated GPA Above The Mean And Students With Accumulated GPA Below The Mean On Twelve Selected Variables

(Mean - 1.72)

	Accum GPA Above Mean (N-378)		Accum GPA Below Mean (N-560)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.69	1.64	19.16	1.52	4.98	.01
Yr. In Sch.	2.10	1.08	1.45	0.79	10.12	.01
Accum GPA	2.32	0.46	1.31	0.41	34.61	.01
Sem. GPA	2.13	0.81	1.19	0.82	17.38	.01
Acad. Load	14.37	3.17	13.83	2.88	2.63	.01
CEEB Verbal	461.87	83.14	413.45	77.98	8.97	.01
CEEB Math	487.30	88.07	451.29	88.50	6.13	.01
CEEB Total	947.81	153.22	861.93	153.49	8.41	.01
# Involved	1.33	0.47	1.41	0.49	2.57	.05
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.74	0.81	1.99	0.97	4.31	.01
Action Taken	1.27	0.44	1.34	0.48	2.49	.05

Table 117

Extracted Variance For Students Having Committed An Hours Offense

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	73.85	73.85
II	Personal and Grade Point Average Data	21.67	95.51

Table 118

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students Having Committed An Hours Offense

(N-200)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loadings
CEEB Total	.959
CEEB Verbal	.867
CEEB Math	.786

Factor II--Personal and Grade Point Average Data

Variable	Promax Loadings
Year In School	.738
Age	.703
Semester GPA	.463
Accumulative GPA	.450

Table 119

Factor Intercorrelations For Students Having Committed An Hours Offense

Factor	I	II
I	-	
II	.352	-

Table 120

Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed An Hours Offense

(N - 200)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.122	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.677	-.125	-									
Accum GPA	.181	-.069	.320	-								
Sem. GPA	.187	-.039	.306	.614	-							
Acad. Load	-.036	-.034	.023	.314	.261	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.160	.013	-.036	.449	.279	.273	-					
CEEB Math	-.056	-.023	.030	.368	.180	.220	.603	-				
CEEB Total	-.162	.001	-.033	.431	.245	.262	.885	.843	-			
# Involved	.047	.029	.063	.021	.016	.013	.041	.029	.011	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.056	.062	-.082	-.115	-.062	-.141	-.095	.048	-.019	.056	-	
Action Taken	-.148	-.117	-.085	-.136	-.141	-.125	.053	.063	.085	.084	.010	-

Table 121

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed An Hours Offense

(N - 200)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.	.677											
Accum GPA			.320									
Sem. GPA			.306	.614								
Acad. Load				.314	.261							
CEEB Verbal				.449	.279	.273						
CEEB Math				.368		.220	.603					
CEEB Total				.431	.245	.262	.885	.843				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 122

Extracted Variance For Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	71.88	71.88
II	Personal Data	20.25	92.13
III	Grade Point Average Data	5.00	97.12

Table 123

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

(N-224)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	.812
CEEB Total	.809
CEEB Verbal	.553

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.780
Year In School	.764

Factor III--Grade Point Average Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Semester GPA	.591
Accumulative GPA	.494

Table 124

Factor Intercorrelations For Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	-.117	-	
III	.500	-.000	-

Table 125

Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

(N - 224)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.052	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.707	.034	-									
Accum GPA	.004	.035	.208	-								
Sem. GPA	.166	.080	.313	.488	-							
Acad Load	-.115	-.122	-.060	.082	.198	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.025	.068	.047	.349	.290	.194	-					
CEEB Math	-.026	-.154	.029	.240	.188	.110	.559	-				
CEEB Total	-.040	-.067	.061	.319	.279	.151	.835	.849	-			
# Involved	-.104	.058	-.109	-.059	-.061	-.058	.089	.131	.126	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.091	.014	.045	-.079	.019	-.026	-.110	-.104	-.121	-.066	-	
Action Taken	.078	-.162	.028	-.103	-.207	-.104	-.081	.021	-.057	-.048	-.053	-

Table 126

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

(N - 224)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.707											
Accum GPA			.208									
Sem. GPA			.313	.488								
Acad. Load					.198							
CEEB Verbal				.349	.290	.194						
CEEB Math				.240			.559					
CEEB Total				.319	.279		.835	.849				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken					.207							

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 127

Extracted Variance For Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	71.08	71.08
II	Personal Data	13.40	84.48
III	GPA Data	10.72	95.20

Table 128

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

(N-153)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.884
CEEB Math	.856
CEEB Verbal	.681

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.783
Age	.772

Factor III--GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Semester GPA	.684
Accumulative GPA	.684

Table 129

Factor Intercorrelations For Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.260	-	
III	.168	-.110	-

Table 130

Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

(N - 153)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.175	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.708	-.124	-									
Accum GPA	-.018	.070	.284	-								
Sem. GPA	.024	.059	.260	.708	-							
Acad Load	-.075	-.117	-.075	.107	.166	-						
CEEB Verbal	.059	-.026	.166	.369	.333	.194	-					
CEEB Math	.064	-.371	.148	.301	.258	.217	.616	-				
CEEB Total	.029	-.240	.176	.389	.341	.174	.852	.866	-			
# Involved	-.011	-.150	.047	.062	.029	.127	.018	.085	.040	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	-.021	-.101	-.061	-.200	-.267	-.047	-.028	.024	.011	-.065	-	
Action Taken	.159	-.419	.140	.033	.021	.231	-.070	.203	.081	.048	.112	-

Table 131

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

(N - 153)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.708											
Accum GPA			.284									
Sem. GPA			.260	.708								
Acad Load												
CEEB Verbal				.369	.333	.194						
CEEB Math		.371		.301	.258	.217	.616					
CEEB Total		-.240		.389	.341		.852	.866				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale				-.200	-.267							
Action Taken		-.419				.231		.203				

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 132

Extracted Variance For Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Variance Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test and Semester GPA Data	65.75	65.75
II	Personal Data	17.94	83.70
III	Personal and Offense Data	12.27	95.97

Table 133

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense

(N-206)

Factor I--Entrance Test and Semester GPA Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.957
CEEB Math	.858
CEEB Verbal	.760
Semester GPA	.407

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Year In School	.804
Age	.739

Factor III--Personal and Offense Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Sex	-.714
Action Taken	-.570
Number Involved	.462

Table 134

Factor Intercorrelations For Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.291	-	
III	-.216	-.156	-

Table 135

Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense

(N - 206)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.175	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.700	-.073	-									
Accum GPA	.074	.029	.298	-								
Sem. GPA	.079	.080	.265	.648	-							
Acad. Load	-.099	-.051	.035	.124	.112	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.142	.192	-.014	.353	.356	.106	-					
CEEB Math	-.095	-.179	.022	.329	.377	.104	.532	-				
CEEB Total	-.178	.020	-.037	.390	.413	.128	.851	.858	-			
# Involved	-.070	-.423	-.155	-.045	-.106	-.048	-.042	.089	.047	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.106	.078	-.004	.010	.013	-.112	.036	-.076	-.051	-.105	-	
Action Taken	-.022	.459	-.106	-.024	.045	-.104	.168	-.071	.081	-.213	.232	-

Table 136

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables For Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense

(N - 206)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. in Sch.	.700											
Accum. GPA			.298									
Sem. GPA			.265	.648								
Acad. Load												
CEEB Verbal				.353	.356							
CEEB Math				.329	.377		.532					
CEEB Total				.390	.413		.851	.858				
# Involved		-.423										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken		.459								-.213	.232	

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 137

A Comparison Of Students Having Committed An Hours Offense And Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

	Hours Offense (N-200)		Falsification Offense (N-153)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.09	1.11	19.58	1.60	3.24	.01
Sex	2.00	.00	1.67	.47	8.39	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.55	.82	1.94	1.00	3.93	.01
Accum GPA	1.84	.71	1.82	.68	.20	NS
Sem. GPA	1.63	.99	1.77	.93	1.44	NS
Acad. Load	13.47	3.21	13.89	3.04	1.27	NS
CEEB Verbal	448.19	86.32	432.25	87.06	1.71	NS
CEEB Math	440.76	81.86	460.98	94.33	2.11	NS
CEEB Total	882.65	154.29	889.26	170.05	.38	NS
# Involved	1.14	.35	1.23	.42	2.11	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.74	.85	2.00	.96	2.65	NS
Action Taken	1.27	.44	1.39	.49	2.39	NS

Table 138

A Comparison Of Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense And Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

	Alcohol Offense (N-206)		Falsification Offense (N-153)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.25	1.48	19.58	1.60	1.95	NS
Sex	1.20	.40	1.67	.47	9.92	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.61	.90	1.94	1.00	3.27	.01
Accum GPA	1.72	.68	1.82	.68	1.45	NS
Sem. GPA	1.57	.94	1.77	.93	2.03	NS
Acad. Load	14.31	2.81	13.89	3.04	1.34	NS
CEEB Verbal	434.77	86.63	432.25	87.06	.27	NS
CEEB Math	482.98	97.62	460.98	94.33	2.05	NS
CEEB Total	915.07	165.23	889.26	170.05	1.44	NS
# Involved	1.51	.50	1.23	.42	5.86	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.73	.80	2.00	.96	2.79	.05
Action Taken	1.07	.07	1.39	.49	7.20	.01

Table 139

A Comparison Of Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense And Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

	Alcohol Offense (N-206)		Theft Offense (N-224)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.25	1.48	19.21	1.45	.27	NS
Sex	1.20	.40	1.11	.32	2.62	NS
Yr. In Sch.	1.61	.90	1.52	.87	.99	NS
Accum GPA	1.72	.68	1.53	.54	3.12	.05
Sem. GPA	1.57	.94	1.31	.81	3.04	.05
Acad. Load	14.31	2.81	14.35	2.99	.13	NS
CEEB Verbal	434.77	86.63	419.50	80.13	1.89	NS
CEEB Math	482.98	97.62	463.95	83.72	2.05	NS
CEEB Total	915.07	165.23	881.68	150.83	2.18	NS
# Involved	1.51	.50	1.52	.50	.07	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.73	.80	2.08	.99	4.01	.01
Action Taken	1.07	.07	1.55	.50	12.55	.01

Table 140

A Comparison Of Students Having Committed An Hours Offense And Students Having Committed A Theft Offense

	Hours Offense (N-200)		Theft Offense (N-224)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.09	1.11	19.21	1.45	1.04	NS
Sex	2.00	.00	1.11	.32	40.76	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.55	.82	1.52	.87	.34	NS
Accum GPA	1.84	.71	1.53	.54	4.95	.01
Sem. GPA	1.63	.99	1.31	.81	3.51	.01
Acad Load	13.47	3.21	14.35	2.99	2.92	.05
CEEB Verbal	448.19	86.32	419.50	80.13	3.53	.01
CEEB Math	440.76	81.86	463.95	83.72	2.88	.05
CEEB Total	882.65	154.29	881.68	150.83	.07	NS
# Involved	1.14	.35	1.52	.50	9.10	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.74	.85	2.08	.99	3.82	.01
Action Taken	1.27	.44	1.55	.50	6.22	.01

Table 141

A Comparison Of Students Having Committed An Hours Offense And Students Having Committed An Alcohol Offense

Variable	Hours Offense (N-200)		Alcohol Offense (N-206)		T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
	x	SD	x	SD		
Age	19.09	1.11	19.25	1.48	1.29	NS
Sex	2.00	.00	1.20	.40	2.77	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.55	.82	1.61	.90	.67	NS
Accum GPA	1.84	.71	1.72	.68	1.74	NS
Sem. GPA	1.63	.99	1.57	.94	.56	NS
Acad. Load	13.47	3.21	14.31	2.81	2.82	.05
CEEB Verbal	448.19	86.32	434.77	86.63	1.56	NS
CEEB Math	440.76	81.86	482.98	97.62	4.62	.01
CEEB Total	882.65	154.29	915.07	165.23	2.04	NS
# Involved	1.14	.35	1.51	.50	8.77	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	1.74	.85	1.73	.80	.85	NS
Action Taken	1.27	.44	1.07	.26	5.31	.01

Table 142

A Comparison Of Students Having Committed A Theft Offense And Students Having Committed A Falsification Offense

Variable	Theft Offense (N-224)		Falsification Offense (N-153)		T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
	x	SD	x	SD		
Age	19.21	1.45	19.58	1.60	2.23	NS
Sex	1.11	.32	1.67	.47	12.91	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.52	.87	1.94	1.00	4.21	.01
Accum GPA	1.53	.54	1.82	.68	4.42	.01
Sem. GPA	1.31	.81	1.77	.93	4.97	.01
Acad. Load	14.35	2.99	13.89	3.04	1.45	NS
CEEB Verbal	419.50	80.13	432.25	87.06	1.44	NS
CEEB Math	463.95	83.72	460.98	94.33	.31	NS
CEEB Total	881.68	150.83	889.26	170.05	.44	NS
# Involved	1.52	.50	1.23	.42	6.05	.01
Soc-Ec. Scale	2.08	.99	2.00	.96	.79	NS
Action Taken	1.55	.50	1.39	.49	3.16	.01

Table 143

Extracted Variance For Students Given Probation

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test	67.36	67.36
II	Personal Data	21.74	89.10
III	Personal and Offense Data	8.06	97.16

Table 144

Promax Loadings Of the Rotated Factors For Students Given Probation

(N-645)

Factor I--Entrance Test

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Total	.903
CEEB Math	.879
CEEB Verbal	.646

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.793
Year In School	.791

Factor III--Personal and Offense Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Sex	-.628
Number Involved	.439

Table 145

Factor Intercorrelations For Students Given Probation

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	.197	-	
III	-.548	-.381	-

Table 146

Correlations Of All Variables For Students Given Probation

(N - 645)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.049	-										
Yr. In Sch.	.738	-.008	-									
Accum GPA	.078	.149	.257	-								
Sem. GPA	.162	.133	.276	.563	-							
Acad. Load	-.161	-.120	-.071	.088	.126	-						
CEEB Verbal	-.093	.089	.004	.369	.269	.126	-					
CEEB Math	-.051	-.279	.033	.282	.226	.164	.546	-				
CEEB Total	-.097	-.134	.011	.356	.274	.157	.837	.856				
# Involved	-.074	-.411	-.082	-.115	-.132	.027	-.019	.110	.048	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.018	-.029	-.026	-.132	-.130	-.027	-.082	-.061	-.077	-.004	-	
Action Taken	-.008	.044	-.029	-.037	-.006	-.059	-.038	-.056	-.051	-.031	-.037	-

Table 147

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables

For Students Given Probation

(N - 645)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex												
Yr. In Sch.	.738											
Accum GPA			.257									
Sem. GPA			.276	.563								
Acad Load												
CEEB Verbal				.369	.269							
CEEB Math		-.279		.282	.226		.546					
CEEB Total				.356	.274		.837	1856				
# Involved		-.411										
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 148

Extracted Variance For Students Given Suspension

Factor Number	Factor Name	Variance Pct.	Cum. Pct.
I	Entrance Test Data	73.03	73.03
II	Personal Data	18.98	92.01
III	Academic Data	4.81	96.82

Table 149

Promax Loadings Of The Rotated Factors For Students Given Suspension

(N-293)

Factor I--Entrance Test Data

Variable	Promax Loading
CEEB Math	.795
CEEB Total	.755
CEEB Verbal	.495

Factor II--Personal Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Age	.775
Year In School	.770

Factor III--Academic Data

Variable	Promax Loading
Accumulative GPA	.626
Academic Load	.625

Table 150

Factor Intercorrelations For Students Given Suspension

Factor	I	II	III
I	-		
II	-.047	-	
III	.554	.015	-

Table 151

Correlations Of All Variables For Students Given Suspension

(N - 293)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age	-											
Sex	-.207	-										
Yr. in Sch.	.726	-.140	-									
Accum GPA	.111	.110	.316	-								
Sem. GPA	.182	.052	.382	.684	-							
Acad. Load	-.029	-.144	.020	.162	.179	-						
CEEB Verbal	.025	.178	.045	.415	.356	.180	-					
CEEB Math	.051	-.142	.057	.314	.237	.149	.568	-				
CEEB Total	.012	.019	.061	.407	.345	.153	.849	.837	-			
# Involved	-.040	-.183	-.019	.038	.027	.067	.040	.134	.100	-		
Soc-Ec. Scale	.021	-.024	-.030	.002	.014	-.108	-.028	.055	-.003	-.010	-	
Action Taken	-.015	-.079	-.016	.025	-.004	.014	-.032	.007	-.013	.042	-.117	-

Table 152

Significant* Correlations Of All Variables

For Students Given Suspension

(N - 293)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Age												
Sex	-.207											
Yr. in Sch.	.726											
Accum GPA			.316									
Sem. GPA			.382	.684								
Acad Load												
CEEB Verbal				.415	.356							
CEEB Math				.314	.237		.568					
CEEB Total				.407	.345		.849	.837				
# Involved												
Soc-Ec. Scale												
Action Taken												

*Levels of Significance: .1946 to .2539, .05
.2540 to .3210, .01
.3211 or above, .001

Table 153

A Comparison Of Students Given Suspension

And Students Given Probation

	Students Given Suspension (N-293)		Students Given Probation (N-645)			
Variable	x	SD	x	SD	T-Ratio	Level Of Significance
Age	19.51	1.90	19.32	1.43	1.49	NS
Sex	1.35	.48	1.44	.50	2.69	.01
Yr. In Sch.	1.72	1.01	1.71	.95	.07	NS
Accum GPA	1.61	.70	1.77	.63	3.23	.01
Sem. GPA	1.39	.96	1.65	.91	3.79	.01
Acad. Load	13.86	3.47	14.13	2.77	1.19	NS
CEEB Verbal	430.57	80.76	434.05	84.77	.60	NS
CEEB Math	467.04	84.10	465.24	92.66	.29	NS
CEEB Total	897.12	153.40	896.27	161.68	.08	NS
# Involved	1.34	.47	1.39	.49	1.42	NS
Soc-Ec. Scale	2.00	.99	1.83	.88	2.53	.05
Action Taken	2.00	.00	1.00	.00	265.44	.01